

Mr. THOMAS. I withhold my vote, as I am paired with that Senator.

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I inquire if the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. WALSH. I have a general pair with that Senator. I am unable to get a transfer and accordingly withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. THOMAS. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I inquire whether the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. WADSWORTH (after having voted in the negative). The junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS], with whom I have a pair, is absent. I therefore withdraw my vote, having voted under a misapprehension.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN] who is absent. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. FERNALD] and vote "nay."

Mr. WALSH. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MARTINE] and vote "yea."

Mr. STERLING. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] to the senior Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] and vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILMAN]; and

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM] with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH].

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 29—as follows:

YEAS—41.

Ashurst	James	Pittman	Stone
Bankhead	Kern	Ransdell	Swanson
Beckham	Kirby	Reed	Thomas
Broussard	Lea, Tenn.	Robinson	Thompson
Bryan	Lee, Md.	Saulsbury	Underwood
Chamberlain	Lewis	Shafroth	Vardaman
Chilton	Myers	Sheppard	Walsh
Fletcher	Newlands	Shields	Williams
Hardwick	Overman	Simmons	
Hitchcock	Owen	Smith, Ariz.	
Hughes	Phelan	Smith, Ga.	

NAYS—29.

Borah	Fall	McLean	Sterling
Brady	Gallinger	Nelson	Sutherland
Brandeggee	Harding	Norris	Townsend
Clapp	Husting	Page	Watson
Clark	Jones	Penrose	Weeks
Cummins	Kenyon	Sherman	
Curtis	Lane	Smith, Mich.	
du Pont	Lodge	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—26.

Catron	Gronna	Martin, Va.	Smith, S. C.
Colt	Hollis	Martine, N. J.	Tilman
Culbertson	Johnson, Me.	O'Gorman	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Johnson, S. Dak.	Oliver	Warren
Fernald	La Follette	Poin Dexter	Works
Goff	Lippitt	Pomerene	
Gore	McCumber	Smith, Md.	

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water-power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. I now ask for the reading of the bill for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for the information of the Senate.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the Senate has been in session now for five hours and has had a rather strenuous day. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator not to press that motion.

Mr. PENROSE. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. STONE. It is not debatable, I know; but I ask the Senator to withdraw it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I will withhold it for a moment, if the Senator desires.

Mr. STONE. I will say to the Senator that I desire to move an executive session of a very few moments.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I withdraw my motion that the Senate adjourn and move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 10, 1917, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 9, 1917.

POSTMASTERS.

INDIANA.

Frank L. Allen, Clayton.
Andy E. Smith, Wolcott.
Marquis D. Yotter, Silverlake.

MAINE.

John L. Donohue, Rockland.
Thomas M. Nichols, Jackman.

NORTH CAROLINA.

C. G. Conner, Rich Square.
J. Lawrence Harrington, Aulander.

PENNSYLVANIA.

George L. Anderson, Avondale.
Nettie Beatty, Beatty.
Isaac P. Boogar, Oaks.
George F. Carr, McAdoo.
Jacob H. Gallmeyer, Topton.
Ezekiel S. McElhatten, Shippensburg.
Miles L. Ritter, Newport.
Margaret E. Taylor, Orbisonia.
Alvin L. Wenzel, Webster.

VERMONT.

Antonio Bonazzi, Plainfield.
Riley W. Densmore, West Burke.

WEST VIRGINIA.

Edward H. Shanklin, Union.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 9, 1917.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, let Thy blessing descend upon us that we may be prepared to meet the duties of life as they unfold themselves in accordance with our highest conceptions of right and truth and justice; that we may thus use the powers of mind and soul with which Thou hast endowed us to the good of mankind, and enjoy the full fruition of a well rounded out life, worthy of all emulation; in the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 703, the vocational education bill, and pending that I ask unanimous consent that Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the Record upon this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that Members may have five legislative days within which to extend their remarks in the Record upon this bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the vocational education bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill S. 703, with Mr. PAGE of North Carolina in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 7. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Federal board for vocational education a sum not exceeding \$200,000 annually, to be available from and after the passage of this act, for the purpose of making or cooperating in making the studies, investigations, and reports provided for in section 6 of this act, and for the purpose of paying the salaries of the officers, the assistants, and such office and other expenses as the board may deem necessary to the execution and administration of this act. The Federal board for vocational

education may allot any part of said appropriation to any United States department or bureau for the purpose of making any study or investigation, or part thereof, under the provisions of this act.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of inquiring the purpose of the authorization as carried in the last sentence of this section, deputing to the Federal board the authority to allot part of the appropriation to any bureau or department of the Government for study or investigation.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, it is necessary that the board should have a certain amount appropriated for the administration of their labors, and this was carefully considered by the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. There is no disputing that fact. I am trying to ascertain the reason why the committee vests authority in this board to apportion some of this money to other bureaus and departments of the Government.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. HUGHES. Certainly.

Mr. FESS. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that one of the purposes of the Federal board was to make studies and investigations covering the entire field of vocational education, including agriculture, and in order to make those studies the question came up at once, Shall they be made through special commissions or shall they be made through the departments already created? And one object was to connect the operation of the Federal board with the departments now in existence under the control of the Cabinet departments.

Mr. MANN. As set out in section 6?

Mr. FESS. Yes; as set out in section 6; and these last four lines in section 7 were intended to make it possible for the Federal board to carry on this investigation through the respective Cabinet departments with their army of investigators already created. That is the object of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman realizes the policy of Congress to hold the activities of the respective bureaus to the work and to the extent that Congress has appropriated. This authority as carried in this paragraph would take away the supervisory control of Congress over the activities of the various bureaus, so far as the amount the board can expend is concerned, and to that extent Congress would lose control over the activities of the respective bureaus of the Government.

In the legislative appropriation bill, for instance, we provide considerable amounts for various activities of the Bureau of Education. I assume this item has more application to the activities of the Bureau of Education than any other activity of the Government. Yet the legislation restricts, and properly restricts, their activities to the amount that the committee determined should be utilized for those respective activities, and under this authority Congress would lose control. We would vote this board some \$200,000 every year, and they, without any control at all, would say, "Well, we will launch into this activity or that activity; we will have this bureau magnify itself to the extent of doubling or trebling or quadrupling its activities by extending the appropriation \$25,000, \$50,000, or \$100,000 a year," when Congress does not intend they should go to that extent.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, what the gentleman says is true, I think, without a doubt; but in this particular provision the Federal board has control of the \$200,000, and this law gives them the latitude, if the board wants to exercise it, to do this investigation set out in section 6 through these other departments without creating new ones, and in that way the Congress has not lost any control that it already has not delegated to this Federal board.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the need of vesting in this board this broad power to allot the appropriation? Why should not Congress have the right to determine how much money should be expended by the various bureaus and divisions of those bureaus?

Mr. FESS. I think that would not do at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, from the viewpoint of the educator it would not, and that is confirmed by the Chief of the Bureau of Education; it is confirmed by the head of every bureau in every department. They do not wish to be hamstrung or limited at all by Congress. They want to have lump-sum appropriations so that they can carry on their activities without restriction whatsoever, but experience has shown that it is well

for the Government that Congress should place limitations upon their activities. We can become enthusiasts in these matters, and yet it is proper for Congress to keep control of the activities of these various boards and bureaus.

Mr. FESS. The question I wanted to ask is this: There is \$200,000 provided for the administration under the control of this board—

Mr. STAFFORD. Not exceeding \$200,000.

Mr. FESS. Not exceeding \$200,000. That \$200,000 may be utilized either by direct expenditure through appointment of various investigators or by delegating whatever it sees fit in amount to some investigators already in existence. In the latter case there is no more loss of Congress's control over the fund than the former, and I can not understand why the gentleman insists upon that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Because the gentleman fails to realize that when this item of appropriation is considered by the Committee on Appropriations it will not be able to determine how much money is being used for the various activities. The board will say they need so much money, and there will be no accounting whatsoever, as far as the administration of that fund is concerned, the bookkeeping end, to determine whether the money is being expended in this line or in that line.

Mr. FESS. This board has to make report to Congress once every year as to every expenditure of that \$200,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, it makes a report, but we have no control over the allotment. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a bad practice to lose control of the purse strings of Congress in this way, so that we can not control the activities of the respective bureaus of the Government.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I am in entire sympathy with the general view of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. I hardly think, however, that this particular provision is subject to the criticism he makes, at least to the extent he makes it. The gentleman will notice that in the last part of section 6, at the bottom of page 9, we have these provisions made:

Such studies, investigations, and reports concerning agriculture, for the purposes of agricultural education, shall, as far as practicable, be made in cooperation with or through the Department of Agriculture—

Mr. MANN. "Through"?

Mr. TOWNER. "With or through." Then the next provision is—

Such studies, investigations, and reports concerning trades and industries, for the purposes of trade and industrial education, shall, so far as practicable, be made in cooperation with or through the Department of Labor—

And so on, with the other several objects that are set out in the bill.

Now, the object of those provisions was primarily for economy. I recognize the fact that the gentleman belongs to the Committee on Appropriations, upon whom a special responsibility lies. I know he is working very ably and well in the interest of economy, and that the House is indebted to him and the people of the country are indebted to him for the care with which he challenges these various items of expenditure, and it is for that very reason to obtain economy in the operation of this bill that these provisions have been made. Now, it would be utterly impossible, I will say to the gentleman, for us to specify with particularity how much could be used or should be used in this method of assisting the various departments in their particular work in so far as it may be of assistance to us. It may be that nothing will be required from this \$200,000 for any one of these particular departments; in others a large part may be required. For instance, a special investigation that might be of considerable importance to the commission might not be so important to the Agricultural Department, and for that reason the commission might be willing to bear a large proportion of the expense in that particular matter. In other cases, in regard to other investigations, the department might bear a much larger part of it. So that I say the matter is very wisely left to the discretion of the commission and the department.

We have also, as is suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], tried to make it so that the Committee on Appropriations will be able to determine, or anybody will be able to determine, just what amount of money is and has been used and for what purpose it is used, because a report to Congress must be made annually as to what particular expenditures have been made, so that Congress can see whether or not they have been made wisely. It is in that view of the case the committee has acted in the premises and, I hope, wisely.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, section 6 refers to the investigations we are to make, and these last four lines refer to having it done through the department already created, and I ask

unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this time the field of investigation as set out by the President's vocational commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the statement indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The statement is as follows:

1. A study of the movement for vocational education in other countries which will, with constant reference to the similarities or differences between their conditions and our own, furnish this country with an authoritative estimate of the causes lying behind the movement, the progress and tendencies of the work, the efficiency of different types of schools and their adaptation to American conditions and needs, and the educational, social, and economic results.

2. A study of the different types of vocational schools of all kinds which are in operation in this country, interpreting their courses of study and methods of instruction, in terms of their adaptation to the aim of the school, and the conditions to which they are to be adjusted.

3. A study of the efficiency, not only of the different types of schools but of all the vocational schools of the country, as measured by the success of their students.

4. Full information each year as to the progress of vocational education in this country, bringing up to date the statistics concerning schools already established, and calling attention to changes and tendencies, while at the same time laying particular emphasis upon new schools and new experiments and devices.

5. Information concerning such things as buildings, equipment, cost of instruction, supplies, and courses and methods of instruction, which will furnish first-hand knowledge to those desiring to establish new schools.

Information for agricultural education: The Government has already done much to promote agricultural education through the Department of Agriculture. Large appropriations have been given, which the department has applied in making studies, investigations, and experiments concerning agriculture and agricultural processes, and the resulting information has not only been of use to the farmer but also to the agricultural schools in their courses of study.

Knowledge of agriculture is much more widely disseminated than knowledge of other vocational processes. On some phases of agriculture exhaustive work has been done. These studies and investigations should be continued, to furnish materials for a more scientific agriculture, and their scope should be broadened to meet the needs of a wider range of persons in farm life.

Much of the work already done has been of a highly scientific character. This work should not be neglected, but it should be supplemented by studies of the simpler processes applicable to the more common and everyday problems of the farmer.

It is highly important that, from the great mass of data at hand and from data to be collected from further studies, more direct application be made to the use of the material in giving instruction in agriculture.

Information for home economics education: Several of the Federal departments and bureaus have already made numerous valuable studies affording information useful in the development of home economics education. A large part of this study has been along the line of foods—their preparation, composition, and nutritive values; and along the line of the construction, sanitation, and equipment of the farm home.

These studies have not only been of use in the country districts, but they have been of wide value to schools and colleges for their courses of instruction in home economics. The results have been productive of so much good that the work should be enlarged and extended with a view to placing training for the maintenance and care of the home on a scientific basis. Aside from studies which directly benefit the individual home maker there is great need of larger and more detailed information regarding vocations which are based on a knowledge of home economics—callings such as those of the dietitian, the institutional manager, the matron, the lunch-room or tea-room manager, the professional cook, and other similar occupations.

The problem of home economics training for the great mass of girls who spend their early years as wage earners in stores, shops, and factories is also one for serious consideration and investigation, and one that has as yet hardly been touched, although it is perhaps more important and far-reaching than any other. Especially needed are such studies as those relating to the purchase and care of clothing, the conservation of health and the maintenance of efficiency through proper food and exercise, the planning of personal and household budgets, the proper sanitation and ventilation of home and work-room surroundings. Such studies as these and many others will be greatly needed in the development of part-time education for girls who are already at work, and would also be highly valuable in developing courses in home economics for young housekeepers who have not had the opportunity for such training in our schools.

While approving of every possible means of extending the more scientific studies and research for the development of home economics, the commission feels that the particular need at the present time is for material which will reach down to the average girl, who goes neither to high school nor to college, but upon whose training for the care of a home and family the future welfare of society will largely depend.

Information for commercial education: What has been said before of the need of wider knowledge for agriculture and for industries is equally true in general as to commerce for the purposes of commercial education. Among the many questions concerning which the country should have information for use in the training of commercial workers the following have been suggested:

Supply and demand for trained commercial workers.

Distribution of commercial workers.

Selection and placement of commercial workers.

Descriptive analysis of the world of commercial pursuits in the broad lines of employment, such as banking, accounting, business management, executive service, salesmanship, and ordinary clerical work.

Descriptive analysis of each one of these lines of employment into specific occupations and of each occupation into such important factors as source of supply of commercial workers, prevailing salaries, demands upon the worker as to general and commercial education, opportunities offered for training for higher responsibility, next position in regular order, how far previous experience prepares for the next position, the additional school training necessary as proper preparation for advancement.

The changing conditions of commerce, which bring changing requirements upon the commercial workers in any line of commercial employment.

The requirements upon commercial workers in dealing with foreign commerce.

The number and classes of foreign commercial schools of different types.

Information for trade and industrial education: We now furnish a large amount of information to aid the farmer in meeting his problems. It is just as necessary that the Government should supply knowledge for the better preparation of human labor in industry as that it should furnish information concerning soil fertility, fertilizers, pests, insects, and the best methods of farm organization for the farmer.

There is a great and pressing need for an analysis of our industries as the first step in forwarding an intelligent program for the training of industrial workers. We need an intensive study of the requirements upon wage earners in the specific occupations into which each industry is divided. Not until this is done will it be possible to know in an accurate and comprehensive way the particular kinds of training which any group of workers should have or how that training can best be given.

Among other helps for industrial education we need such things as the following:

To analyze the industries into their branches or occupations.

To ascertain what the worker in each of these occupations needs in skill and knowledge.

To learn how far this skill and knowledge can be obtained in regular work in the occupation.

To know what use is made of apprenticeship, cooperative, and trade agreement plans for the training of workers in any industry.

To know what the industry fails to give in the way of skill and knowledge that the worker needs for thorough efficiency.

To learn what the school can do in this connection.

To make careful reports from time to time, showing the progress, present conditions, problems, and tendencies throughout the country of the movement for industrial education.

To secure timely knowledge of pronounced changes in industrial processes, materials, and organizations, which affect the proper education of workers to meet trade requirements.

There are many other questions that should be answered, of which the following are examples:

What is the preferred age for beginners in any given industry in this country?

What are the upper and lower limits as to the age of the efficient worker in any given occupation?

What are the upper and lower limits as to the wage received?

What are the sources of supply for workers in a given occupation?

What are the physical requirements upon the worker in a given occupation, such as strength, endurance, quickness, dexterity, fineness of sight, accuracy?

How long does it usually take to train a worker for a given occupation?

What are the occupations within an industry to which a worker may advance?

How far does the work of his present occupation prepare the worker to meet the requirements of the new one?

What is the supply and demand for workers in the various industries and occupations?

In which industries and occupations is there the greatest opportunity at the present, or any given time, for desirable employment?

Only with such knowledge will it be possible to place industrial education in this country upon an intelligent basis. Only when we have learned these things will we be able to standardize the requirements for teachers, develop proper courses of study and correct methods of teaching, and measure the efficiency of the schools in terms of what their students are able to achieve. Some agency able to cope with the problem must assist the States in this task.

The need is as great for information concerning trade and industry for use in preparing workers to manufacture goods as it is for information concerning agriculture for use in the training of farmers. The high degree of specialization in industry, the complex character of both our manufacturing processes and industrial organization, and the rapid and pronounced changes in our manufacturing life make the need for such a survey particularly urgent. In a nation-wide attempt to educate our wage earners such intensive surveys of all kinds of occupations present a field for national service by Government agencies as large and important as it is indispensable and difficult.

It is not possible to rely upon individual employers for the information necessary for a program of industrial education national in its scope. Individual employers have had little or no experience in dealing with such problems in the large, and they would, of course, be inclined to look at it only from the standpoint of their own limited interest and outlook. Furthermore, to attempt the work in this way would result only in a piecemeal job. Each manufacturer would naturally find out things which might be of general use, but would employ them only for his own benefit. This would obviously result in a large duplication of effort. Even if the investigations of individual manufacturers were well made, there would be no opportunity for comparing results. Furthermore, there could not be the widespread publicity necessary to make such results available to everybody having the same questions to face.

Neither could the task be adequately accomplished through national organizations of employers. Such organizations have had little, if any, experience in doing this work. There are, comparatively speaking, few great national organizations of employers which are equipped to undertake such a task. The present interests of such organizations would not induce them to take the time or money necessary. There are, moreover, certain grave differences between employers and employees regarding certain matters in industrial training, and these differences might easily prove a handicap to either national labor organizations or national associations of employers if either attempted to handle this matter.

This method of getting information through special interests would require a long time, even if it could be successfully accomplished in the end. It would mean piecemeal and irregular studies with disconnected results and the absence not only of a country-wide and unbiased point of view and method of approach but also of the publicity which would be of the greatest benefit to all concerned.

The States can not deal individually with this matter: No State is adequately equipped to handle it; no State has had any considerable experience, at least, with this kind of investigation; no State has even made a beginning in such work, nor could any State possibly have the necessary nation-wide point of view. Furthermore, a study

of this kind by the States acting separately would be open to practically all the objections given above.

The work must be done by the National Government. The training of our workers is a national question. It requires a national outlook to approach it properly. The National Government is the one unbiased agency for the task, and the only one capable of making comprehensive studies which will be useful everywhere. Both States and individuals would have confidence in the work performed and the information disseminated by the Federal Government.

National grants for vocational schools create a greater need of assistance from Federal agencies in securing information for use in these schools. If the States should support unaided their own vocational schools this service by the Federal Government would be valuable, but with Federal grants for these schools the argument for larger Federal investments in expert information and advice has added force.

Vocational schools and classes will be successful in proportion as their organization, courses of study, and methods of instruction meet continuously the changing needs and conditions of the vocations for which they give preparation. If the schools are to fit properly for vocations, all those in charge of them must have an opportunity to secure such progressive knowledge, and this can best be furnished through a Federal agency that will give such studies a nation-wide point of view.

Should the Government establish a partnership or contract of any kind with the States for the benefit of any kind of vocational education, every consideration requires that the moneys expended in the venture should be accompanied by all the helpful knowledge which the Federal Government has gleaned or can glean from its studies. In order that every wage earner may be made an "all-round workman," the training which he receives either at the State or National expense should endeavor to prepare him as far as possible to meet successfully the varied demands of his occupation as it is practiced throughout the country. This requires an interchange of trade information such as only a Federal agency can give.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 11. That in order to receive the benefits of the appropriation for the salaries of teachers of trade, home economics, and industrial subjects the State board of any State shall provide in its plan for trade, home economics, and industrial education that such education shall be given in schools or classes under public supervision or control; that the controlling purpose of such education shall be to fit for useful employment; that such education shall be of less than college grade and shall be designed to meet the needs of persons over 14 years of age or who are preparing for a trade or industrial pursuit or who have entered upon the work of a trade or industrial pursuit that the State or local community, or both, shall provide the necessary plant and equipment determined upon by the State board, with the approval of the Federal board for vocational education, as the minimum requirement in such State for education for any given trade or industrial pursuit; that the total amount expended for the maintenance of such education in any school or class receiving the benefit of such appropriation shall be not less annually than the amount fixed by the State board, with the approval of the Federal board, as the minimum for such schools or classes in the State; that such schools or classes giving instruction to persons who have not entered upon employment shall require that at least half of the time of such instruction be given to practical work on a useful or productive basis, such instruction to extend over not less than 9 months per year and not less than 30 hours per week; that at least one-third of the sum appropriated to any State for the salaries of teachers of trade, home economics, and industrial subjects shall, if expended, be applied to part-time schools or classes for workers over 14 years of age who have entered upon employment, and such subjects in a part-time school or class may mean any subject given to enlarge the civic or vocational intelligence of such workers over 14 and less than 18 years of age; that such part-time schools or classes shall provide for not less than 144 hours of classroom instruction per year; that evening industrial schools shall fix the age of 16 years as a minimum entrance requirement and shall confine instruction to that which is supplemental to the daily employment; that the teachers of any trade or industrial subject in any State shall have at least the minimum qualifications for teachers of such subject determined upon for such State by the State board, with the approval of the Federal board for vocational education: *Provided*, That for cities and towns of less than 25,000 population, according to the last preceding United States census, the State board, with the approval of the Federal board of vocational education, may modify the conditions as to the length of course and hours of instruction per week for schools and classes giving instruction to those who have not entered upon employment in order to meet the particular needs of such cities and towns.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, lines 3, 4, and 5, after the word "requirement," insert a comma and strike out the words "and shall confine instruction to that which is supplemental to the daily employment."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that the committee may accept this amendment. The propriety of it was brought to my attention by a Member of the House who is engaged on committee work this morning. The amendment proposes to strike out the limitation as to night classes, requiring that the instruction shall be confined to that which is supplemental to daily employment. If there is one thing that a boy is to be commended for it is that having labored during the day he takes advantage of such educational facilities as may be afforded him at night.

Now, it may be that some boy who desires to obtain a vocational training may be obliged to labor very industriously during the daytime at some occupation which he desires to equip himself in by his studies in the evening, and if there be such a boy he probably would be the most deserving of all boys seeking an education. He would be of that type which we commonly regard as self-made in that he would be earning his

own livelihood during the day for the purpose of maintaining himself and others, possibly, with a view of taking up some special line of instruction in the evening. It may be that such a boy seeking to learn the vocation of a metallurgist or of a machinery worker might be employed in an entirely different vocation during the day, and if the training here provided for is to be confined to the instruction that is carried on in the daytime this deserving boy may be thrown out altogether.

I leave it up to the experts of the committee who have studied this question. It presents to me one of the real humanitarian features of this bill. If we want to encourage anybody on earth to learn a useful occupation we want to encourage that boy who is striving as hard as he can all day long to take care of himself and those who may be dependent upon him, and who yet in the evening may not want to be confined to the particular line of education he has been acquiring, of necessity, during the day.

I am raising the question. The committee may have some explanation that may be satisfactory, but it has seemed to me, as it seemed to the Member who brought the matter to my attention, that by placing this limitation upon the night-school service you may be wiping out the lifelong ambition of a boy who is perhaps the most deserving of any who would apply for this kind of education.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, the observation made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] is not only an appealing observation to most Members of the House but would seem on its face to be a justifiable amendment that ought to be made. But I hope the membership of the House will see the real meaning of it and not allow their desire to help the boy who is on the street and who wants to get out of that work into something else, to aid him to get into this particular sort of school, however laudable that desire is.

There are two classes of evening schools now in nearly all of our big cities. One is the evening preparatory school to enter some avenue of activity or some industry; that is, to prepare to get into something different from what he now is engaged in. Nearly all the cities of the country have the evening school for that purpose now existing. Then there is another evening school that is more prominent than that one, and that is where the adult has gone into work and has reached the age now beyond the school age, where he can not go to school, except to the evening school, and who had gone into work before he had a general education. He sees the need of having a general education now since he has gone out into the active world to work, and he wants to go where he can study, not the thing he is working at but the subjects of general education in order to enlarge his fund of information and increase his cultural qualities. That school, of course, is not the preparatory school that I spoke of before. The two are clearly defined, discriminated easily, and every city has both of them, as a rule.

Now, this provision is that the Federal money to be applied to evening schools shall be applied to the evening extension school, to extend the work of the boy who is now at work. It is strictly vocational. It is not to be applied to some one who is wanting to get out of the work he is doing into some other field. If it is preparatory, that school now exists, supported by the city. It is not to study something of a general cultural value that is not connected at all with his work. That is already provided in the city. But it is to simply enlarge upon his ability to do the work he is now doing. If you spread this out to include the preparatory school and also the cultural school, you are going to dissipate the fund in the evening extension school until it will be of no particular value at all.

Then, another consideration in the discussion of this subject before the President's commission was this: The evening school is now very prominent. It will not be in the years to come. The evening school is going to grow less from day to day, because our compulsory system of education is going to enlarge the day school and make less the importance of the evening school; and it will not be, in my judgment, 20 years until the evening school will be largely a thing of the past, while the continuation school will grow more prominent and important. And that is another reason the commission confines its work to the extension school in the evening rather than the preparatory school.

Mr. REILLY. The gentleman does not claim that his vocational school is going to be a cultural school, does he?

Mr. FESS. He is aiming to avoid that.

Mr. REILLY. How would the boy who has some line of work in the daytime, who does not like the work he might take in school, going to take up cultural work if he goes to your vocational school in the evening?

Mr. FESS. The vocational school in the evening that is provided by this bill is purely a vocational school, but the school

that is preparatory may be cultural or may be both vocational and general.

Mr. REILLY. Very true, then. How will the boy who comes from the street pursue a general course in any vocational school that you object to?

Mr. FESS. There will be vocational courses in the evening school in the city. My objection to this is that it should be confined to the extension school and not to the preparatory school, as my friend from Pennsylvania wants, or to the other school that I mentioned, but which he did not mention.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. As I regard this as one of the most important features of the bill I would like to ask the gentleman one or two questions. If we consider this bill without regard to terms as to preparatory or extension courses, where is the boy on the street, who is striving the best he knows how to be an honorable boy and to make a decent living, to get his vocational education under this system?

Mr. FESS. He will get it where he gets it now, at the evening school.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; but if he is not pursuing the same line of study in the daytime—

Mr. FESS. He is not excluded now from the evening school.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think the bill as it reads now does exclude him.

Mr. FESS. This bill confines it; but the evening schools now existing will admit him. This bill will not preclude those schools.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman means the existing schools, aside from this bill?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I do not want to see this—which is a general vocational education bill—bar out any boy in the city or in the country, whether there happens to be a school in his vicinity at the present time or not. He certainly is as much entitled to the benefits of this bill as the boy who lives some place where there is no vocational school.

Mr. FESS. The only difference is this: Why should we widen the scope of the evening school under this provision so as to let anybody come into it, whether he is extending the work he is now doing or taking something that he is not now working at? That is the point.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want this law made general, so as to help the boy who is deserving and who is doing the best he can in the daytime against untoward circumstances of living—I want that boy to have an equal chance with any other boy to take advantage of this bill. But I observe—and I fear that what the gentleman has already explained rather justifies the thought—that, apart from what we have been discussing, there is provision here which limits certain privileges to towns of 25,000 population.

Mr. FESS. No; towns of less than 25,000 population are not covered.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What is the theory?

Mr. FESS. The theory is that the difference in the towns would be so wide that the general law will not cover them. We leave it to the State board to make one rule for one town and another rule for another town, always by the approval of the Federal board.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In other words, a town exceeding 25,000 inhabitants which pays for itself is to get nothing and we are to give it all to towns of less than 25,000 inhabitants.

Mr. FESS. Oh, you are talking about evening schools?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; I am talking about the evening schools provided in this bill.

Mr. FESS. This proviso does not cover the evening school. This covers the general bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; beginning on line 2 of page 16 the language is:

That evening industrial schools shall fix the age of 16 years as the minimum entrance requirement and shall confine instruction to that which is supplemental to the daily employment.

Now, I am trying to strike out—

Mr. FESS. That is daily employment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I am trying to strike out that limitation as to the boy or girl attending the evening school. But, as I understand the gentleman now, he thinks the provision ought to remain in, because perchance it may be that in the

city of New York they already have industrial schools and night schools.

Mr. FESS. They do.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And therefore the Government ought not to extend its general educational system to the city of New York, although it pays part of the taxes. That does not seem fair.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. FESS. Gladly.

Mr. MANN. To see if I understand the theory of this bill. It is not expected, as I understand, that the money appropriated in this bill is to furnish education for all people who may desire it, but within the limits provided in the bill to endeavor to furnish vocational education?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. MANN. And not intending to furnish, out of the provisions of this bill, education to everybody, it is proposed to confine it to vocational education, and in doing that to give assistance to those who are now in some vocation?

Mr. FESS. That is the whole purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more, to make a statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. The bill provides for three kinds of schools—the all-day school, the part-time school, and the evening school. The all-day school requires a limitation in age. The pupil must not be less than 14 years of age. The evening school makes the limitation 16 years. In the all-day school there is a provision that the work shall be extension work, one-half of the time be spent in the classroom and one-half in the shop or field. The part-time school is where the individual has gone to work for pay, and the limitation in time, in hours of recitation, is fixed by law 144 hours per year. In the evening school, however, we do not limit the time, but we say that the limitation must be confined to those who are studying in the evening industry that they are working at during the day. I do not believe that it would be wise to take the fund out of the three types, to disseminate it without limitation in the evening school that is not going to be continuous. Anyone can see that the evening school is going to lessen from year to year if the all-day and part-time schools will be inaugurated. It will not do to dissipate this fund, to extend to all classes who might want to go into the evening school, and thus popularize the evening school at the expense of the part-time and all-day schools. I sincerely hope that the fund will not be thus dissipated, but will be confined to the extension work in the evening school while the evening school lasts.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all discussion on this section and amendments thereto conclude in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all discussion on this section and amendments thereto conclude in 20 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore].

The explanation of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] that there are three grades of schools does not, as I see the situation, change it at all, as all three schools are vocational schools.

Mr. FESS. They can not utilize this fund unless they are.

Mr. REILLY. Then all of these vocational schools should be open to every boy in the community, of the proper age who desires to attend them, regardless as to whether or not the boy desires to receive instructions along the lines of his daily employment; at least discretionary power should be left with the local authorities to permit such boy to attend one of these vocational schools.

Night schools are not at the present time established in all parts of the country. They are comparatively new institutions and besides they provide for a general education and not for vocational instruction.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. REILLY. The gentleman from Texas will kindly excuse me; my time is limited.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. REILLY. It would seem that if a boy who is engaged during the daytime, not in walking the streets, but in a line of work which he is obliged to follow for want of a job to his liking, should not be debarred from the opportunity to attend a vocational night school located in his home town simply because he desires vocational training to qualify him for a line of industrial work other than he is engaged in at that time, but that he intends to take up as the means of making a living.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman allow me to interrupt?

Mr. REILLY. Yes.

Mr. FESS. This is precisely what this bill is trying to prevent. If the boy is educated to be a farmer, and wants to be a better farmer, he would not go to the school in order to get out of farming into something else. We want his skill and efficiency to be applied to the thing which he is doing. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. REILLY. Does the gentleman maintain that a boy who wants to quit the farm should be kept on the farm and denied an opportunity to get vocational training along some other line?

Mr. FESS. Not at all, but if he is going to quit he should not get the provisions of this bill that pertain to the farm.

Mr. REILLY. If a boy wants to quit the farm, he should be given an opportunity to take up some other line of vocational education, and the mere fact that he is a boy from the farm should not debar him from attending a vocational night school to get training in some industrial line.

Mr. FESS. Let me ask the gentleman a question. Is it not true that in the gentleman's State boys who come up from the farm to the university, intending after their education to go back to the farm, go into cultural work—the professions—at least a large percentage of them, and never return to the farm? This is the thing we are trying to avoid.

Mr. REILLY. My observation is that only a very few boys have entered the University of Wisconsin with the intention of returning to the farm again. There are a few cases where boys have entered the agricultural college, and later switched their course from the special line of agriculture to a general college course.

Mr. FESS. That is what I mean.

Mr. REILLY. But assuming these facts to be true, that does not justify shutting the door of a vocational school to any boy in the community who desires to secure vocational training, no matter in what line, or no matter whether the boy is from the farm or the city.

Mr. FESS. We do not close the door, but we say to him, "If you want this particular training, you can get it in this school, but if you want some other training, not supplemental to your work, go to some other school to get it."

Mr. REILLY. But the other school is not a vocational school. There is no use trying to drive boys back to the farm or keep them there against their will. The boy who works on the farm in the daytime and is looking forward to a career as a mechanic should be permitted to attend an evening vocational school to prepare himself for the line of work that he intends to follow.

I am very much in favor of the pending measure and I hope that it will become a law before the present session of Congress adjourns, thereby adding one more constructive piece of legislation to the long and creditable record of the present administration.

Many of the leading educators of to-day, men and women who have given deep thought and study to the educational problem, are convinced that our present educational system is top-heavy, that it does not offer sufficient facilities for the efficient education of the great mass of boys and girls of to-day who will be men and women of to-morrow.

Under the existing educational conditions in this country, too much time and money is devoted to the higher education of the few and too little time and money to the education in the practical ways of life of the many. In round numbers there are 30,000,000 children in this country between the ages of 6 and 20 years, inclusive, of which number about 50 per cent reside in the country and 50 per cent in our cities and villages.

It is stated that 85 per cent of the children of the country leave school before they reach 16 years of age; that not over 8 per cent of the school boys and girls ever go through high school; and that only about 3 per cent of those who graduate from high school go on to the higher schools and colleges. More than a million of the boys and girls of our country are added each

year to the army of industrial and agricultural workers of the land, most of them without any practical training designed to make successful and efficient breadwinners.

There can be no doubt at all but that our present educational system is not meeting the real needs and requirements of this day and age as far as the practical preparation for life's battle of the industrial and agricultural doers upon whom our future as a Nation largely depends.

Our educational system to-day is too theoretical, not enough practical; too extensive, not enough intensive. The training that the large majority of the boys and girls receive is not of the character to prepare them for the practical work of life.

Unfortunately, our educational system has been hampered by so-called educational fads. Every little while some ambitious mortal desiring to reform the world offers a new educational theory which is guaranteed to be a panacea for all human ills and the result is the curriculum of the lower grades has become crowded with a lot of new-fangled, half-baked educational ideas, none of them bearing upon the practical education of the child.

If part of the money being spent to-day in our higher educational institutions could be diverted to the work of training our future citizens, the 85 per cent that never go beyond the high school, much better results would be obtained from the enormous expenditures, over \$600,000,000, in this country every year for educational purposes.

Friends of the vocational educational movement believe that something should be done in the way of training vocationally the 85 per cent of our school population who under the present conditions are turned out into the world to begin life's battle handicapped for want of knowledge of how to do, and they hope that this bill when it becomes a law will mark the beginning of an educational movement in this country that will make it possible for every boy and girl to go out into the world equipped with practical training for life's work.

This bill provides for three lines of vocational education—agricultural, trades and industry, and home economics.

The initial appropriation on the part of the National Government for the first year of the operation of this bill is only \$1,500,000, but the appropriation is to be increased annually until at the end of the tenth year the annual contribution of the National Government will be \$7,000,000 a year. In order to secure such appropriations from the National Government, the various State governments are required to put up at least an equal amount, so that at the end of the 10 years, if all the States of the Union take advantage of the national aid provided for in this bill, there will be expended annually in this country at least \$14,000,000 a year in the upbuilding and maintenance of a vocational educational system.

When the full limit of the national appropriation at the end of 10 years is reached, \$3,000,000 of said appropriation is to be devoted to agricultural vocational training, to be apportioned to the States in the proportion that the agricultural population of the various States holds to the agricultural population of the Nation; \$3,000,000 to vocational training in trades, industries, and home economics, the apportionment being based on the ratio that the industrial and trade population of the various States holds to the industrial and trades population of the Nation, all of said sum to be used in paying part of the salaries of the teachers in these three lines of vocational education; and \$1,000,000 to be devoted to the training of teachers in the three fields of agriculture, trade and industry, and home economics, making in all a total sum of Federal aid of \$7,000,000, which will be of the national appropriation for the year 1927 and thereafter.

It is to be hoped that this measure will fully meet the expectations of its friends and well-wishers; that it will mark the beginning of larger expenditures in this country for the practical preparation for life of our future citizens.

Our country is far behind other countries in the world in the important work of preparing our youths to become efficient workers in agriculture and industry.

Germany has long been a leader in the practical education of her youths. Much of Germany's efficiency is due to the fact that education in Germany is more practical and less theoretical than in other countries.

The Kingdom of Bavaria, a territory having a population about the size of New York, has more trade schools than there are to be found in all the States in this Union. It has been said that there are more economic workers being trained at public expense to-day in the city of Munich than in all the cities of the United States. The aim of the German educational system is to prepare Germany's citizens not theoretically but practically, through her great vocational educational system,

to become efficient workers in whatever field of activity they may adopt as their life's work.

A country is great when the masses of its citizens are contented and happy. There can be no contentment and happiness among our industrial and agricultural workers unless there is efficiency, and if we are going to produce in this country an army of efficient workers in all fields of human activity, the cultural side of education, so long emphasized in this country, must claim less attention of the time and revenues of the Government, in order that the more practical education in the training of how to do may receive its due emphasis.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the more the gentleman from Ohio explains this proposition the more I am inclined to believe the amendment is right. I sympathize with him in his suggestion that we ought to keep the boy on the farm by educating him to be a farmer, and that there are large inducements for the boy who started on the farm to leave the farm and go into the city; but the gentleman entirely overlooks the great industrial situation, and I regret to say that there are very few spokesmen here who take up that side of the educational question. It may not be known to the gentleman from Ohio, or to the majority of this House, but the industrial trades to-day, particularly the building trades, are sorely in need of skilled mechanics, the supply of whom is growing less and less day by day. It may be due to certain labor conditions which I do not care to discuss at this time, but the fact is that in a great city like Philadelphia we do not have the men skilled in the building trade to keep up with the demand for them. Now, granted that you are endeavoring to keep the boy on the farm—which I approve—what about that boy in the city with the widowed mother, weak and sickly, and who is her sole support? Through the aid of friends she obtains for him a position as a boy tending a door in a broker's office. Is that the business that he is to follow at night when he takes advantage of this vocational education bill to secure an education? Or he becomes an errand boy in a law office. Is that what you want him to learn, when we are seeking boys at high wages to follow industrial lines? Suppose he becomes a "washer-out" in a beer saloon. Is that the business in which you desire to have him taught, and is that the vocation you wish him to follow in the study that he takes up at night? What is to become of this boy who is not a farmer's boy, but who is just as worthy of consideration, or who may become just as dangerous a member of the community as any man against whom you now inveigh, if when he knocks at the door for an opportunity to learn at night, to be a bricklayer or to be a tinsmith, or a carpenter, you say, "No." Because he is earning a few dollars per week in a bank, because he is running errands, because he is an office boy, or because he works in a factory, therefore in order to obtain the advantages of this vocational education bill, must he follow the errand-boy trade at night? Must he study being a doorkeeper's boy at night, or must he study the ticker at night in order to be admitted to these night schools?

Gentlemen, I hope you will give this matter serious consideration, and bear in mind that while the purpose to keep the farmer's boy on the farm may be commendable, and I believe it is, you must not bar from an honorable and honest education the boys in the city who will have no place to go except the street after their day's work is done if you refuse them admission to this national-school advantage, provided for by the money of all the people of the land. [Applause.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I believe this bill is one of the most important measures which will come before Congress. Every business man outside, perhaps, of the professions, is aware that the trend of the young men to-day is away from vocations of the hand and favoring the vocations of the brain. I contend that both are necessary and that both should be more or less attained by every student, especially those who will be compelled sooner or later to look to their own industry for support. There are innumerable instances all over the country where the services of young men are needed for mechanical and other positions of trust at excellent remuneration which it is hardly possible to fill. An advertisement in a paper for a person to fill a clerical position at \$15 a week will bring a sheaf of answers, but an advertisement for a young, intelligent man to learn a trade and develop executive ability along this line remains unanswered in many instances. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I favor this measure and I hope it will be enacted into law. Nothing will more benefit the country at large than the stimulation and direction of the ideas of the young to broaden their field of endeavor and to realize that mechanical and business development is as valuable if not more valuable than the development merely of their mental powers along professional lines. [Applause.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think it would be unfortunate if the amendment of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] should be adopted. I want to illustrate from a little personal experience. I left home when I was 10 years old. I went to work. The first job I had was carrying water to a lot of men. I got 50 cents a day. I had no education, of course. I found as I went along in the effort to learn a trade, which would eventually enable me to embark in business, that I would have to have some education. I knew that I would not have time to get a general education and so I conceived the thought that it would be wise to go to school at night, notwithstanding the fact that I worked hard all day. When I went to school at night I determined that I would learn things that had to do with the business on which I embarked. I did the things that would make me more proficient in business, make me more valuable to the man who employed me, and more valuable to myself. It soon occurred to me that I was going to learn the business and remain in it for a livelihood. I knew the line of work I would have to do, and so I concluded the kind of education I must have. I learned mechanical drawing, as well as the things that had to do with the work I was called upon to do. I learned to be a draftsman, and then I learned engineering, and learned just exactly the things that applied to the work that I was engaged in, and the things that would render me fit to take hold of the technical things connected with the business. Out of the small compensation I received from time to time I paid for the little education I was able to obtain. The result was that because of the training connected with the work I was enabled to do things that other boys were unable to do, and the result was that when opportunity for promotion came I had the opportunity given to me. And so it was I was able to succeed.

Now, I believe that if you are going to use the night schools for training, that training ought to be along the work which the pupils who attend them are engaged. If the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] is adopted it will cut out the very things which this bill provides. I hope, basing my statement on my own experience, that this bill if enacted, as I hope it will be, will contain the provision in lines 3, 4, and 5, page 16, the language of which I quote—

and shall confine instruction to that which is supplemental to the daily employment.

Nothing could be more important, in my judgment, than training the mind of the boy that is willing to go to school at night along the line that he is employed in during the day.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has made a success in life, and it constitutes a very interesting chapter in the lives of Members of Congress. The gentleman states that he began by carrying water. Of course, that was not the occupation he studied at the night school. I ask the gentleman if he had begun by being an errand boy in an office, or by washing out a saloon, whether he would like to have been obliged to follow studies on similar lines at night?

Mr. MADDEN. Fortunately the educational institutions of the United States do not to-day provide for education in the best methods of operating a saloon [applause], and it might be also fortunate if less schools provided a better method of training many lawyers. If we put them into useful employment, where they would develop the wealth of the country, instead of beggaring the conditions after the wealth is developed, we would have better conditions in the United States. [Laughter.]

Mr. REILLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. REILLY. Does the gentleman want to deny the education to these boys which they prefer?

Mr. MADDEN. I am sorry that I can not agree with the gentleman from Wisconsin. In my reading of the clause in this bill it leads me unalterably to the conclusion because of the course I adopted for myself when I had the privilege of making the selection.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Suppose a young man, very poor, goes to work in a telegraph office and learns telegraphy, but he has a greater ambition and would like to get into something better than that, does the gentleman think it would be right to compel that young man to go to this institution and study telegraphy?

Mr. MADDEN. One word in reply to the gentleman. I recall one fact: That Will Gardner lived in the little town of Lamont, Ill., where I was brought up. He was a telegraph operator at a side station. He afterwards became secretary to

the president of the Northwestern Railroad, and later became president of that road. The present president of the Chicago & Milwaukee Road was an obscure operator. He is now president of the St. Paul and a genius in his line. I pay a man that I picked up as a telegraph operator in a freight yard \$15,000 a year now because he had the genius, and the fact that a man is a telegraph operator does not prevent him from becoming a great man. [Applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a very important proposition. The natural sympathy is on one side, but it seems to me that common sense is on the other side. In the United States there are hundreds of millions of dollars every year expended for education, not out of the Federal Treasury but from the local treasuries. We are proposing now to expend a very small amount of money, as compared with the total, for the purpose of vocational education. It is not designed to pay out of the General Treasury money for the education of boys whether they have ambition or not. That is not the purpose of this bill. We are not undertaking to give an education out of the General Treasury to all of the boys and girls in the country, but the purpose of this bill is to give boys a vocational education. If you undertake to spread it all around, you will not give anybody a vocational education.

Now, the first thing to do is to give the boy a supplementary education; that is where you get the most benefit for the boy who does the work, whether on the farm or in the shop. Any boy in the city or on the farm in the country can get a supplementary education at night which will be of great value to him. You want to encourage these boys to go into the night school and study in reference to the work that they are doing in the expectation that you will make them permanent in their particular line of work. This bill is not for the purpose of aiding boys through ambition to change their occupation, but to give to the carpenter who is busy with his work as apprentice in the daytime supplementary education at night, to give the boy in the machine shop supplementary education at night, and if you undertake to give to everyone education at night, you will not give anybody the education he ought to have. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Moore of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 8, noes 45.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return for a moment to section 10 of the bill, for the purpose of getting some information?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to return to section 10 for the purpose of getting some information as to the view of the chairman of the effect of lines 8, 9, and 10 upon a certain class of agricultural schools we have in the State of Michigan. On page 14, in lines 8, 9, and 10, the following language occurs:

That such schools shall provide for directed or supervised practice in agriculture, either on a farm provided for by the school or other farm, for at least six months per year.

We have in our State a number of agricultural schools maintained partly by the State and partly by the district in which the school is located.

Mr. HUGHES. That is the common school, is it?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes; they are agricultural schools connected with high schools. The agricultural college trains the teacher, and the State pays part of the expense. As a rule, those schools are coextensive, as to time, with the village or city school where the class is organized, and that, as a rule, is 10 months. What I would like to know is how young men who are taking those agricultural courses can get six months of supervised practice?

Mr. HUGHES. Under this vocational education bill they would go to school for a certain length of time, but it is specified they must have practical experience in the field for six months.

Mr. KELLEY. Suppose these young men, during the 10 months of the school year, give a certain portion of the time to studying soil, dairying, horticulture, and all that kind of thing, by actual practice on the farms of the surrounding neighborhood, and carry on that work systematically a certain portion of the time each week during the school year, in connection with their classes in the high school, would that be a compliance with this provision?

Mr. HUGHES. I am inclined to think that it would.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes.

Mr. FESS. There was some question as to whether that ought to be six months or four and a half months, making

one-half of the school year of nine months, but taking into consideration the winter months that might be used for stock grading, milk testing, and seed testing, they claim there might be some of the time in the winter while the pupil is in school part of the time when he could do this practical work that is not really out in the field, but is still agricultural work, and so they decided on making it six months in the year, thinking that the practice work was more important than the theoretical.

Mr. KELLEY. If they are required to spend six months out of the nine in supervised work, that would mean that two-thirds of their time would have to be spent in the practical work in the field?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Two-thirds of the time only that they devote to agriculture.

Mr. FESS. Of course, that is the whole year.

Mr. KELLEY. I am heartily in accord with the general purpose of this provision, and yet I wanted to be sure that these young men who are studying agriculture in Michigan and are doing a certain amount of practical work in the field during the regular school year would have such time counted on these six months?

Mr. FESS. They would, and they would not need to be even working in the soil. It can be in the winter months in Michigan, where they are doing some work on the farm. This does not mean that all the time of each month, or week, or even day, must be spent on the farm. It might be a part of the day, or week, or month, throughout the year. That will satisfy the requirements of the law.

Mr. KELLEY. That is all I wanted to know.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 16. That the Federal board of vocational education shall withhold the allotment of moneys to any State whenever it shall be determined that such moneys are not being expended for the purposes and under the conditions of this act.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Moore of Pennsylvania: Page 19, after line 8, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Sec. 17. That no allotment of moneys under this act shall be made to any State which does not require of the teachers, supervisors, or directors of public education an obligation to support and defend the Constitution of the United States or which continues in employment teachers, supervisors, or directors of education who instill into the minds of their pupils theories or opinions subversive of the Constitution or the Government of the United States."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have introduced this amendment with a view of ascertaining whether the committee will accept it. The bill provides for a very large number of teachers, supervisors, and directors of education. While I am in favor of the purpose of the bill and expect to vote for it, I do not intend to let the opportunity pass to say a word about one phase of our present day civilization. We are adding very largely to the expenses of the Government in the employment of a new array of persons who will not be directly under our authority, but to whose support we contribute. Many of these persons will be in control of the education of the youth of the country and will be responsible for the quality of citizenship that develops from that youth.

I have no particular college to point out nor any particular educational institution, but it is patent to anyone who reads the newspapers of to-day, and particularly the strictures upon our form of government which occasionally emanate from some of the learned professors and teachers of the country, that we will in due course, in these educational matters, have a great problem to solve. I think I am not going far astray in saying that there are some college professors who are misleading the young with respect to the purposes and principles of the Government of the United States, very much to the shame of the great mass of educators of this country who are patriotic and well meaning and whose efforts in the direction of education are well bestowed. But the time will come, if it has not already come, when it may be advisable for members of State legislatures, as well as for Members of Congress, to say to certain men and women in control of the education of our children that the expression of their personal opinions with regard to politics, with regard to political economy, with regard to theories of government, sometimes in derogation of the Government itself, must be regulated and that they must attend to the business for which they are paid, to properly educate the youth of this country within proper lines of citizenship and patriotism.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will yield.

Mr. FESS. What about the feasibility of creating a board of censorship?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Well, I take it we have had enough boards of censorship recently, but we can, if the gentleman wants it, create a new board and add to the difficulties of the present administration. But we have been advised upon political topics from school-teachers high and low, and some of the people of the country have been misled by professors of high degree. Their opinions have not always been patriotic, and the question arises whether, when we expend the public money for the purposes of public education, we should tell our employees to confine themselves to the purposes of their employment rather than to lead the children of the country into economic and political error.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLEY. What does the gentleman think of a school-teacher who when he gets into politics changes his mind on all these matters?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think a professor who gets into politics, runs for governor or a higher office, is a man to be watched if he is still to influence the school children of the country. His opinions on questions like the tariff might change.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield for a serious question?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is always serious, and I will endeavor to be as serious in answering him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is there any more harm in a learned professor undertaking to inculcate in the minds of his pupils his own individual opinion than simply to repeat the individual opinion of some other professor who has written a textbook on the subject?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think there is danger in an individual teacher endeavoring to inculcate his individual views on public questions into the minds of children. If the gentleman wants me to proceed any further, I would say it is a very unwise proposition to take a professor from a great college who has only one opinion in regard to a great question like the tariff and put him in charge of a tariff board to control the tariff destinies of this country. It is not always best to put a one-sided, one-minded theorist in control of the tariff of the country.

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman elucidate for the benefit of the committee some process by which any school-teacher may be able to comment on textbooks on any subject without giving expression to his personal opinion?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. "The shoemaker should stick to his last." It is on that theory this bill has been framed, in view of the amendment defeated a few moments ago. The preacher who goes into politics is entering upon dangerous ground, and I am inclined to think the school-teacher should keep out. He can not be a good school-teacher and a political partisan at one and the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the debate on this section and all amendments thereto be now closed. Is there objection?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have the privilege of speaking for not more than five minutes. I do not think I have opened my mouth on this bill up to this time.

Mr. HUGHES. In view of the gentleman's request, I will ask that all debate close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] for his courtesy. I have refrained from prolonging the debate on the bill, although it is not a policy of legislation with which I am in sympathy. I am in sympathy, permit me to say—and now I suppose I am making a futile effort to have my opposition to this bill understood both in the country at large and among many of my constituents—I am in sympathy with the idea of training the young of this country in all ways of making an honest living and doing useful work for society at large. I am in favor of training them in the art of the smith, of the carpenter, and in every other direction in which their minds and hands may be made skillful for the benefit of society at large and in order that they may get an honest living for themselves and their families; but, Mr. Chairman, I can not but regard this sort of legislation as an assault upon the prerogatives and the high duties of the States. We have always believed, most of us at least, that the duty of educating the youth of the country was particularly

and peculiarly that of the family and of the State, and a number of years ago, so many years ago I do not now remember with any degree of clearness or accuracy, time, and particularities, there was considered in the Congress of the United States a bill known, I believe, as the Blair bill—I ask the gentleman from Illinois if that is not what it was called? It was opposed by many distinguished people of the South as an assault on the rights of the States and by a great many eminent and distinguished people in the North as an effort to control the schools of the States by the Federal Government. Now, this is somewhat in the same line of legislation and it is, in my judgment, an assault upon the States and upon their duties and their privileges. Coupled as these assaults are with an appropriation, it is made acceptable to many palates that would otherwise reject it. I venture to make this brief speech, Mr. Chairman, because my position has not been understood by some and has been and will again be misrepresented. If you do not agree with any proposal in toto and if you do not agree with the methods with which that proposition is advanced, you are at once denounced as being opposed to such measures in their purpose. Such is the fashion of speech of the times, such the prevailing intolerance of the day.

As a matter of fact, I am just as much in favor of developing our schools in the States and by the States to the highest degree of efficiency, both in the academic and in the vocational lines, as any man can be. I have my views about how it should be done, and they do not happen to accord with the views of the author of this bill.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. If the gentleman will be brief. I have only two or three minutes.

Mr. FESS. The Blair educational bill had the power with it to apply the money by the Federal authorities, but this bill does not do that.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Oh, no.

Mr. FESS. This bill provides for the cooperation of the State, and the State does not need to receive it if it does not wish to.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Of course not; and if we had the frank and brutal proposition of the Blair bill, my friend from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES], a man whose character is so lovable and whose intentions are so honest that anyone who has come in contact with him must love and respect him, would have rejected it at once. But, Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Fess] that this is but the beginning. It is an insidious attack, sugar-coated, as I said a few moments ago, with an appropriation. I believe as sincerely, sir, as I believe anything in this world—and I have some faiths that I do believe in and stand by—that this is a beginning of the destruction of the State system of public schools. What is to prevent some Member in the future—

Mr. BARKLEY. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I have only five minutes allotted, and then the debate closes.

What is the ultimate purpose of some gentlemen who advocate this sort of thing? What is to prevent them from coming forward with another measure next year, advancing a little bit further toward that result and tempting us with a larger appropriation? That is how it is done, Mr. Chairman, and it will go on and people who pay an indirect tax to the Government, thus failing to appreciate the amount of their contribution to the support of an almost criminally extravagant Government, will consent to these appropriation-carrying schemes because they seem not to appreciate the fact that the same people who will pay this appropriation also pay the direct contributions to the State schools. The same people pay the bills, but instead of paying them directly and after the least expensive method this bill will compel them to follow the most expensive way.

The contribution to the States is contemptible in amount, in derogation of the dignity of the States, and hurtful to the system of public schools within the States, in that it will teach the taxpayers more and more to rely upon Federal appropriations, but it suffices to tempt gentlemen from the traditions and principles of their party, the party of Thomas Jefferson.

A distinguished Member said to me a few minutes ago that the State lines are dim now and growing dimmer. I asked him if this measure, which he supports, is not an assault on the autonomy of the States and helping to make them less and less important in our political scheme. Being an honest man, as well as a Republican, he answered frankly that it did. I invited him to make that statement to the House, which he would not do; but I beg my Democratic brethren from the South to reflect on his observations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. By unanimous consent, all debate on this section and amendments thereto is closed.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 17. That if any portion of the moneys received by the custodian for vocational education of any State under this act, for any given purpose named in this act, shall, by any action or contingency, be diminished or lost, it shall be replaced by such State, and until so replaced no subsequent appropriation for such education shall be paid to such State. No portion of any moneys appropriated under this act for the benefit of the States shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase, erection, preservation, or repair of any building or buildings or equipment, or for the purchase or rental of lands, or for the support of any religious or privately owned or conducted school or college.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I am so much interested in this bill that I had hoped that it might be unanimously passed by this House. I have heard in private conversation a number of objections that have apparently been in the minds of some Members against this legislation. Some of them have somewhat felt that it was a "pork-barrel" proposition. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that there is not anything in this bill that savors of "pork." There is no provision in this bill for the erection of buildings or for the maintenance of schools in any State. The bill simply provides for Federal encouragement to a certain particular kind of education.

And not only is there no savor of "pork-barrel" legislation in this bill, but it is not sectional. Many of us opposed the Shackleford roads bill because we believed it contained an unfair discrimination in favor of certain States at the expense of other States. Under the provisions of that bill States in the North of small area and large population would be obliged to bear an undue burden of taxation for the purpose of constructing roads purely local in character in other States without any comprehensive plan for a system of roads connecting the several States that would be really national in its scope.

On the other hand this bill is absolutely fair. Half of the appropriation goes to States for agricultural education in proportion to their rural population, while an equal sum goes to the great industrial States of the North for technical education in proportion to their urban population. It is the fairest bill involving a Federal appropriation for the encouragement of State activities which are of national concern that has ever been introduced in the Congress of the United States.

Now a number of Members have raised the question of the constitutionality of this bill and I observe that my friend from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] is worried about the encroachment of the Federal Government upon the rights of the States. Away back at the beginning of this Government when that great Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander Hamilton, in his famous Report on the Public Credit recommended legislation incorporating the first bank of the United States, the same question was raised. And Mr. Madison, in charge of the bank bill, was challenged to show any power in the Constitution giving Congress the right to charter any such institution. And then and there was invoked the doctrine of implied powers. It was shown that, while there was no direct power granted to Congress in the Constitution to charter a bank and that while apparently the chartering of banking corporations was a State matter, that power could be implied from the power to borrow money; could be implied from the power to raise and support armies; and could be implied from the power to provide and maintain a Navy.

And, Mr. Chairman, in this bill the power of Congress to encourage and aid the States in agricultural and technical education can be implied plainly from those same two clauses in the Constitution, because to-day one of the greatest factors in preparedness, in raising and supporting an Army and in providing and maintaining a Navy, is the question of an adequate food supply for this country in any emergency that may arise. Moreover, one of the greatest factors in raising and supporting an Army and providing and maintaining a Navy is the existence of a sufficient number of men trained in the industrial arts, and in that particular we in this country are sorely lacking. Mr. Chairman, if there ever was a bill whose constitutionality in this critical period, when we are talking so much about national preparedness, can be maintained, it is this bill. I trust it will receive the vote of every Member of this House. [Applause.]

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 12 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in 12 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Education, of which the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the Hon. DUDLEY M. HUGHES, is chairman, has unanimously reported this bill to the House and recommended its passage. It provides for vocational education, and vocational education as defined in this bill refers to that kind of practical education which is designed to prepare girls and boys for useful employment and occupation. It is further designed to prepare workers for the more common occupations in which the great masses of our people find useful employment. As here used, it means that form of education whose controlling purpose is to give training of a secondary grade to persons over 14 years of age, for increased efficiency in useful employment in the trades and industries in agriculture, in commerce, and commercial pursuits, and in callings based upon a knowledge of home economics.

This proposed legislation is based upon the theory that every occupation may be so filled as to reflect intelligent guidance. It provides for the training of teachers of agricultural, trade, and industrial and home economic subjects, for the paying of part of the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects, and of teachers of trade and industrial subjects. The great necessity for this legislation is shown in the fact that there are 12,659,203 boys and girls in the United States engaged in agriculture, who will be directly benefited by this bill. There are also engaged in manufacturing, economic, and allied industries 14,261,376 boys and girls who will also be greatly benefited.

While vocational education has already been inaugurated in many localities, the American people have hardly begun the work of providing for the practical education of these millions of our wageworkers. In this whole country there are fewer trade schools than are to be found in the little German Kingdom of Bavaria, with a population not much greater than that of New York City. There are more workers being trained at public expense in the city of Munich alone than in all the larger cities of the United States, representing a population of more than 12,000,000. It is substantially true that practically every German citizen who could profit by it may receive vocational training for his life work in the schools and classes supported out of the public treasury, and this accounts largely for the efficiency and progress of the German people.

This bill proposes Federal aid in two spheres—first, payment of salaries of teachers of agricultural subjects and all teachers of trade and industrial subjects, and, second, preparation for training of teachers of the foregoing subjects. The importance of the training of teachers and the great necessity for it at the present time is demonstrated in the following facts in reference to the teachers in this country published by the Bureau of Education:

BETTER TEACHERS FOR THE RURAL SCHOOLS.

The rural schools of the United States are in sore need of better qualified teachers. At least one-third of the rural teachers for the country at large have no professional training. The average scholarship of this class of untrained teachers is little more than an eighth-grade education. There are 212,000 one-teacher rural schools in the United States. It is conservative, therefore, to say that there are 70,000 rural teachers in this country with only an elementary education and no professional training. There is one State in the Union that has over 4,000 teachers with only a seventh-grade education and no professional training in charge of its rural schools this year. There are several States that number their rural teachers in this class by the thousands, and there are many States that count their rural teachers in this class by the hundred.

Another third of the rural teachers of the United States have only a limited amount of professional training, and on an average their scholarship is not above the tenth grade; that is, a two-year high-school education beyond the eighth grade. There are at least 70,000 teachers in this class.

A majority of the remaining one-third of the rural teachers of our country have on the average only a four-year high-school education, which includes from one to two years' attendance at a State normal school or the professional work given in the junior and senior years in teacher-training high schools or several summer terms at summer schools for teachers.

These are the conditions that face us in the qualifications of our rural teachers. The problem that confronts us is how to improve these conditions. It is the purpose of the Bureau of Education to issue a series of talks in an effort to show the country how to solve this most important problem in American education to-day. The fact that we have over 150,000 teachers without adequate preparation for their work is enough to arouse the public mind on this question to such a degree that within the next decade we shall have a sufficient number of teachers with adequate training for every rural school in the United States.

I know nothing personally as to the correctness of these figures, but they are authentic and I presume correct, and therefore I have quoted them.

The teachers throughout the land will have an opportunity to avail themselves of the benefits of this bill, which will redound not only to their good but to the permanent and great benefit of the boys and girls whom they will have the oppor-

tunity to teach in their schools. There is no greater calling in this country, except it be the minister of the gospel, than that of the school-teacher. I believe the two most important and far-reaching affairs of life are the cultivation of the mind and the salvation of the soul. [Applause.] The teacher cultivates the mind; the minister is instrumental in securing the salvation of the soul. One scatters sunshine and happiness during the lives of those taught by cultivating their minds, the other brings happiness, contentment, and joy in time and throughout eternity by being instrumental in bringing about the salvation of the soul; and both the teacher and the minister engage in a glorious work upon which the great God of the Universe showers His blessing and approves the instrumentalities used to bring about these glorious results. [Applause.] In my judgment, this is one of the most important measures before Congress, and so important was it that our great President of the United States, the greatest in my judgment since the days of Jefferson [applause], specifically urged the passage of this bill in his annual message delivered before Congress in December.

I congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES] upon his faithful, efficient, and conscientious work in bringing before the House of Representatives this great measure for our consideration and approval. On the 4th of March next he will go out of this House and retire to private life, to the regret, I am sure, of each and every Member on this floor on both sides of this Chamber. He is a most excellent and distinguished gentleman, one of the most faithful and efficient Members of this House, and one who enjoys the greatest respect and the largest confidence of the entire membership of the House of Representatives. [Applause.] He is in every sense of the word a "southern gentleman," in the truest and fullest sense of that term, and that means that he has the highest conception of integrity, chivalry, and honor, and is devoted to this great Government and the fundamental doctrines and principles upon which it was founded by the fathers of the Republic. In his devotion to it he has brought to bear his splendid talents, his energy, and his industry in working out this great bill, which will be a blessing to humanity. [Applause.] While he will leave here on the 4th of March, he will never be forgotten by the membership of this House, and he will not be forgotten by the boys and girls of this great country, for he will by this bill erect to himself a monument more imperishable and enduring than any monument of brass or of marble. By being instrumental in securing the passage of this bill and putting it upon the statute book as a law of the land, he will have a monument in the minds and in the hearts of the present generation and generations yet to come. May God bless him, and make his days of the future the best of his life, as he will be able as they pass by to contemplate with great satisfaction and genuine pleasure the imperishable and indestructible work he has performed in the interest of the whole country during his service in the House of Representatives. A nobler, more generous, or chivalrous man never served in this House or went out after faithful and efficient service from it to the private walks of life.

Long live our good friend, the chivalrous gentleman and our faithful coworker, Hon. DUDLEY M. HUGHES, of the grand old State of Georgia, which State he greatly honors. [Great applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I sometimes almost think that as a people we are overeducated mentally along cultural lines. Of course, I do not really think that we are overeducated in the broad sense or even up to the standard yet. For years we have been going on the principle of teaching a few things to train the mind in the primary schools, in the higher grades, and to a large extent in the colleges and the universities, and for the ordinary day labor we have relied upon immigration. Ever since I was a boy there has been a great work in looking after the railroads, digging the ditches, constructing sewers; and a large share of the manual labor, what we call the cheaper labor, has been performed by people who have recently come over from the other side. To a very large extent it is true that the children of those men do not follow the same occupations.

But we can not rely upon immigration for ordinary labor forever. What I say has reference particularly to labor in the North. We can not rely upon immigrant labor forever, and in order to get the American citizen, born and reared in this country, to do this class of labor, you have got to fix it so that he can do more work and get more pay. And it is along lines like these that we have got to look in the future to perform the necessary work in our Nation.

This is a step in that direction, designed to encourage young men, especially, to do the labor of occupational work or industrial work, and aid them, while they are learning with their

arms to work, to know how to do the work better and more economically and more profitably for the country and for themselves, through teaching them in the mind how to better handle their hands.

Primarily, it is not the duty of the Government to do this. But we will have to prepare for these things because it is our duty to look into the long-distance future. We will have to prepare to-day for what will happen to our children and our grandchildren and our great grandchildren if we are to maintain the things that this Government and our Nation ought and do stand for. While it is not primarily the duty of the Government, we have adopted in recent years the policy of having the General Government encourage the local governments to do those things which primarily belong to the local governments, and of course one reason for that—and it may be a good reason—is that in the collection of taxes it is easier to raise money from the great centers of wealth when the expenditure of money in these directions is just as necessary in those localities where wealth does not center.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask to extend the time for five minutes more.

Mr. HUGHES. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman be allowed five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois be allowed to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Now, I am through with that line. It became my duty, Mr. Chairman, commissioned by the Republicans of the House, to suggest members of the various committees, including the Committee on Education. The Committee on Education has existed in the House for many years. Shortly after I came here, I think it was, or perhaps before I came, it was presided over by that distinguished patriot, that great citizen, Galusha A. Grow, of Pennsylvania, who was Speaker of this House at the time of the Civil War. But I think the committee was not treated too seriously at that time, just as various other committees are not treated in this House. It was one committee that was then known as "the lonesome-road committee," which to have a meeting would be to break a precedent. But when I named in three Congresses the Republican Members to go on the Committee on Education I realized the importance of the work that might come before that committee, and exercised as much care in selecting the Republican membership of that committee as I would exercise in selecting the membership of the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Ways and Means, or any others of the so-called ranking committees of the House. I picked out—I will not say the best material in the House, because it would be impossible to put all the best material in the House on one committee—but I picked out among the very best men in the House on our side to go on the Committee on Education. The proof of it would be in naming the men who are on the committee. They have done exceedingly good work. I am proud of the men on the committee and of our men on the committee. [Applause.]

I wish to congratulate, in his closing days in this House, the distinguished gentleman from Georgia. [Applause.] Anything that I say good about him now might not harm him, and I hope that the few words I have said about him before did not harm him in his district, though I am somewhat doubtful whether the words of the Republican leader of the House would be of benefit to a Democrat in a benighted district in Georgia, and I am sure his district was benighted. It was not when he was elected to Congress, but it surely was when it declined to return him. [Applause.]

He has the respect, the admiration, and the love of every Member of this House, and we all extend that feeling to him when he goes out from our midst. [Applause.]

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska is recognized to proceed for two minutes.

Mr. SLOAN. I ask leave to proceed for five minutes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, an enforced absence prevented my being here when this bill was up for consideration heretofore. At this stage of its consideration I do not desire to take up much time. I want to say that I am now, and have been for years, in favor of this kind of education. I do not harbor the fears entertained by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], because I believe there is nothing materially new in what we

are doing. The State is suffering less encroachment by the General Government in this than in many other measures favored by the section whence the gentleman hails. What we are doing now is simply coordinating that line of education which American citizens have been working out for themselves individually for a great many years.

If I had been opposed to this legislation, I should probably have been won to it by the statement of the romantic life and success of one of our leading Members, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN]. The story of his life is almost as interesting as the magic story of Aladdin. It certainly will compare favorably with the story of Dick Whittington, who, pressed by poverty and oppressed by unkind employers, was leaving the world's metropolis, when the "Bow bells" spoke in a language which seemed to say, "Return, Dick Whittington, future lord mayor of London." Or like Ben Franklin who, penniless, walked those rough streets of Philadelphia, but which, under his genius, industry, and tact, smoothed and widened, led him to Congress halls, constitutional conventions, and finally into the presence of kings. Or still more modern, like Garfield, whose bare feet upon the towpath made it the highway to the Presidency. Our colleague, Mr. MADDEN, like each of these, utilized the best opportunities he had to discipline the mind and train the hand, which, when driven by unflagging industry, passed him through the gates denied the crowd to the position of power and a seat among the mighty. The 50 cents a day water carrier at 10, the night student at 27, became the capitalist and statesman at 50. That is a tribute at once to him for his achievement and to the Nation for its opportunity furnished now, as never before, for the young man or woman who will learn and do. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Illinois started as a carrier of water, and noting the great importance of his vocation and its possibilities gave wings to his imagination and his ambition. He went to night school, as he stated, for the purpose of developing the vocation in which he was interested and along the lines of his ambition. I am glad that he attained the zenith of a typically successful water carrier's career. In its development we now have the climax. Instead of carrying water he has become a statesman. I am told that a statesman's most delicate and important accomplishment is the carrying water properly, which means on both shoulders. [Laughter and applause.] In that I do not believe that my distinguished colleague has made as shining a success as some others have done. But he has made a success in his profession and vocation, and is now one of the statesmen of America. [Applause.]

If I had time to discuss this question, I should take distinctive issue with what was said on the floor to the effect that the boys of this country are leaving agriculture and going into the professions. The lawyers of this country are decreasing relatively year by year, as are the demands for their services. So are the other professions decreasing relatively year by year. But every year in this country, by leaps and bounds, the cultured, educated young men of the country are passing by law, medicine, and the ministry and entering into agriculture, and are making a success of it. I would like to say to the young men of the United States that not in law or medicine or any of the other professions are they most liable to find success in the next 25 years, but in agriculture throughout the United States. In our own State university young men are avoiding the law and the other so-called learned professions and year by year there is an increase of agricultural students. [Applause.]

This educational plan is based upon the desire of the Government, not to usurp the function of the State which would educate its own but to assist those States which are weak and in the places of their weakness. It is to the interest of the Federal Government to have, in so far as it can, an intelligent and homogeneous people. To this end the Government offers by this measure to cooperate with the States which will develop agriculture, trade, and industry, and home economics learning in a practical way. What the schools of the State are already successfully doing is not to be interfered with. The students who are being successfully dealt with are not to be disturbed. The efforts are to be directed toward those who need special opportunities.

The following are some of the facts that call for this cooperation between Nation and State: Eighty-five per cent of the children entering our public schools leave before they are 16 years of age; less than 8 per cent of our students entering the high school graduate therefrom. Few young men or women learn a trade. In fact, learning a trade through the old course of apprenticeship is seldom followed. And yet coordination of skilled hand and disciplined brain is more imperatively demanded now than ever before. The individual needs it for his own physical and intellectual development. The Nation needs

it that its citizenship may be effective in the arts of peace and the methods of war. Intricate machinery, involving principles of mechanics, pneumatics, hydrostatics, and electricity are so numerous placed about us that handicraft and mental activity have abundant opportunity to profitably mingle.

This plan of education is for the youth above 14 years—for him or her denied of opportunity, or who have neglected opportunity. In either case the demands upon them to seek a livelihood, or their reluctance to study with those much younger than they, will often necessitate this night or part-day school provided for in this measure.

It gives me pleasure upon the passage of this measure to turn to a speech delivered on this floor April 22, 1912, in favor of the then Page-Wilson bill, of which the measure under consideration is a substantial reproduction.

I said, in part, on that occasion:

"The general purpose of this bill is to place the college of agriculture and mechanic arts at the head of a unified system of education relating to agriculture, the trades and industries, and home economics, extending through practically all the schools of the State, including bureaus of demonstration and extension work in each county. Further, while the present bill will set to work practical men as teachers of less practical men, the Page-Wilson bill will direct State colleges and normal schools in providing sufficient well-equipped teachers in the three great departments of practical learning. In short, while the present bill will reach but one great branch of vocational education, the Page-Wilson bill will comprehensively grasp our entire school system and make it useful to all the people who toil.

"The work sought to be done through this bill is not entirely new, nor will it be sporadic. In small and independent ways it is being attempted and wrought out in many different communities through private enterprises or municipal or State plan and aid. To do a thing in America our leaders in thought have but to see the need. Our enterprising men and women seek out, experimentally, the way and then the public, duly advised, places behind it its sanction and support, and within the lapse of reasonable time it is accomplished. Formerly we were a Nation hampered by overproduction, but that period is passed. Consumption, fast speeding on its way, is overtaking production, and our economists of all schools and parties agree that if America would feed itself its depleted soil must be restored. Its swamps and wastes must be reclaimed and the efficiency of its producers enhanced. If America would construct for times of peace and war the things which America needs, the strong hand must be taught to move obedient to a clear and active well-trained brain. So that our youths who will mingle our substances, shape our tools, and form our implements must bring about that mingling of hand and brain which comes only from proper training in the formative periods of life. [Applause.]

"There have been in times past vast sums spent in schools to train men to fight, schools to prepare them for business, schools to fit them for teaching, preaching, thinking, and the alleviation of suffering and the saving of life; but for the establishment and care of that bit of heaven here on earth, the home, where women and children's time is mostly spent and more of the husband and father's time should be, has been left to guess and haphazard. It was allowed to be wrought out from the doubtful experiences of too often antagonistic mothers-in-law who would fain perpetuate their own peculiar system of disorder upon the family constituted by the son of one and the daughter of the other. [Applause.]

"The young woman on the farm, coming from the sources of the foodstuffs and textile materials, has a better opportunity in our colleges and public schools, where domestic science shall be taught, to develop into intelligent educational conductors or superintendents of homes than are those reared in city life or factory shadow. As such, in the years to come, there will be a demand at an increased scale of salary. All reputable labor is honorable, and conduct of a home as wife or employee would be more desirable than toiling in factory; wearying at bargain counters, patiently withstanding, without rebuke, the sneers of haggling customers; or even enduring the strains incident to the teacher's life. And where the best women are, there men are usually found to linger, and many arrange to stay for life. With the poultry and dairy, the two best money-making departments of the farm, women are scoring financial success.

"As time goes on woman's activities in other farm departments will, with our improved facilities, take the lead and reap the benefits of farming's financial opportunities. Parlors and drawing-rooms are negligible apartments. Comfort and happiness lie in the sanitary kitchen, orderly dining room, and well-ventilated bedchamber. These three can always be had in the country. They constitute the best balm for family friction and the most potent antidote for divorce. [Applause.]

"There may be inspiration in tariff changes, in battleship construction, in transportation enterprise, in canal building, and many other activities of our Government, but I know of none entitled to more consideration than the Government seeking to aid the upbuilding of intelligent, well-ordered, sanitary, and happy homes, where the children are to be born who will appreciate and defend the Nation which took an interest in them and theirs. [Applause.]

"It is a matter of congratulation that the school forces of our country, the agricultural forces, and the labor forces are practically united upon this measure, and some day it will be a proud fact, to be recalled by every Member of this body, that he assisted, in whatever capacity, to crystallize into law the proposed measure.

"We are all disappointed in that our census figures show a strong current of our young life moving from the farm to the cities. Philosophers may think, economists may reason, and politicians debate, but one of the large reasons for the high cost of living is this selfsame drift. Upon the ocean currents move that mighty swelling force as if they would submerge the nearing continent, but neighboring and countering currents in due time set in, and the great balance is reestablished and maintained. So should our currents moving from farm to city, from city to village, and from village to farm not be a vast movement, but a nice balancing of currents, which will show the intelligent choice, based upon comfort and opportunity and all callings to become respectable, honorable, and desirable.

"I leave the discussion of the trade schools to Members from the large cities. Of them I am not well informed. I think, in a measure, I do know the farm and home, and whatever can be done to better them will better the generations to come and strengthen our Nation. This must be done if we would retain our leadership in the arts and industries. This must be done if the American race is ultimately to be built up as the distinctive leading race, to see the way, to lead the way, and to hold our rights for the enlightenment and betterment of all mankind." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, am I correct in understanding that general leave has been granted to extend remarks?

The CHAIRMAN. General leave has been granted for five days.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 18. That the Federal board for vocational education shall make an annual report to Congress, on or before December 1, on the administration of this act, and shall include in such report the reports made by the State boards on the administration of this act by each State and the expenditure of the money allotted to each State.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express something of the sentiment of the Committee on Education with regard to its chairman. I am very glad that the Hughes-Smith bill will be known hereafter, whenever it shall be referred to through the centuries to come—because it never will be repealed—as the Hughes-Smith law. I am very glad indeed that inseparably connected with this great law, which is now to be placed on our statute books, will be the name of its joint author, the man whom we so much love and respect here in this House—Mr. HUGHES. [Applause.] I am very glad also that throughout the entire progress of the inception and development of this bill he has been able to give it the benefit of his wisdom and sound judgment down to the present time. From the time when it was introduced and considered by the commission of which he was fortunately a member, throughout the deliberations of the committee and now on the floor of the House, we have had the benefit of his advice and assistance. If this law shall be considered as of great value, as I know it will be in the years to come, if thousands of young men shall look upon it as the primary incentive and the great opportunity that has made their lives a success, I know they will think of him in connection with this bill; and so, I assure him, a great blessing will come to him because of the association of his efforts and his name with this act.

I can not refrain from also voicing at this time the deep regret which I know every Member of the House feels that we are so soon to lose him, both from the committee and from the House. I know every Member of the House who has known him at all personally has learned to love him. They could not help but do so. One of my associates, speaking to-day in private conversation, said to me, "He is the highest type of a southern gentleman." I said to him, "I would amend that by making this statement, that he is the highest type of an American gentleman." [Applause.] Because I would not have it limited to a section, when it comes to the consideration of qualities like those he possesses in such an eminent degree. We are sorry to lose him from this House. We are sorry to lose him from the deliberations of this committee, and I sincerely hope he

will realize that he takes with him the affectionate interest and love of every Member of the House throughout all the years to come.

And now, as we shall end our consideration of this bill, I sincerely hope that there will be such a unanimous approval of this legislation as will carry with it an added compliment to him, an added glory to the renown that will be his because of his having been the joint author of this great piece of constructive legislation. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to trespass upon the patience of this committee, but I do not like to let the opportunity pass without expressing a word with respect to my approval of this legislation. I have been a school-teacher. I never rose to the dignity of a schoolmaster, or a professor, or a doctor of any sort, but as a school-teacher and as a man who has observed the problems of education, I have been impressed with the necessity for the establishment of some institution where special training might be obtained at public expense. I am somewhat of an old-fashioned man. I believe that every man who is born into the world is born with special qualifications for some occupation, and the problem which may determine success or failure is the problem of seeking to find out that occupation for which a man is most suitably fitted. In our common schools and even in our universities there is no special method by which a teacher may give particular attention to any individual pupil. The school-teacher who has charge of 50, 60, or 70 pupils can not have the time, in the very nature of things, to devote special attention to any one pupil or to any given line of thought or occupation, which is designed in the legislation now under consideration; and I am glad, Mr. Chairman, of the opportunity to vote for this bill, not only because it has been fathered by the distinguished and lovable gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HUGHES], but because it provides a means whereby the United States Government shall to some small extent come to the relief and assistance of the boys and girls in this Nation who are seeking to unravel that mysterious skein which we call life, at whose heart, after all, lies the mystery and secret of success.

I do not share, I am glad to say, the fears of my distinguished friend from Texas. I do not look upon our Government as a monster, because the whole can be no worse than its component parts, and the whole of this Nation is made up of 48 States that compose it. I do not believe that our Federal Government is such a monster as to create in my mind any fear because it is cooperating with or assisting the States in things that mean the success and achievement of men who have come up like the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] and dozens of others who sit on the floor of this House. I do not believe that the exercise of that power will be detrimental to our success and achievement, but, on the contrary, I consider it as one of the primal duties of the Federal Government to cooperate in the education and training of the boys and girls of this Nation. [Applause.]

[Mr. RAGSDALE addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to bear with me just a moment. There is no Member of this House that can possibly appreciate the kind words so tenderly expressed more than I do. These words will be handed down as a legacy to my children and children's children, and, whatever may be the decree of the fates and whensoever a cloud may surround me, these words will be a beacon light. My countrymen, my beloved countrymen, my heart is too full for utterance, but it is all yours. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill, with amendments, to the House, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PAGE of North Carolina, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill S. 703, the vocational education bill, and had reported the same back with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HUGHES, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

IMMIGRATION BILL.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I gave notice that I would call up the conference report on the immigration bill (H. R. 10384) on Thursday next, immediately after reading the Journal. I desire now to change that to Friday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama gives notice that on Friday next, after the reading of the Journal and the cleaning up of business on the Speaker's table, he will call up the conference report on the immigration bill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a memorial from the Legislature of Oregon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. SNYDER, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House without leaving copies the papers in the case of Catherine Beard, Sixty-fourth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. WEBB, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for one week on account of serious illness in his family.

THE NEWLANDS COMMISSION.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged report (No. 1268) from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 437.

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall proceed to the consideration of S. J. Res. 190, reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The first reading of the resolution shall be dispensed with, there shall be general debate not exceeding one hour, to be equally divided between those favoring and those opposing the resolution. During the general debate any Member may be recognized by the Chair to offer germane amendments to the resolution. At the end of said general debate the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and all amendments to final passage without any intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I will ask how much time gentlemen on the other side would like to have on the rule.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Fifteen minutes on this side.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the discussion on the rule be confined to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to be controlled by myself and 15 minutes by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and at the close of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that debate on this resolution be confined to 15 minutes on a side, one half to be controlled by himself and the other half by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and at the end of 30 minutes' debate the previous question on the resolution shall be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, this is substantially the same rule that was presented to the House a few days ago for the purpose of bringing up the Newlands resolution and continuing the commission now investigating the transportation facilities of the United States. I have not carefully analyzed all of the provisions of the resolution that the rule brings up for consideration, but my information from those entitled to know, and who do know, is that a provision which provided for the continuation in office of a Representative in Congress after his term expires is eliminated, and that the increased appropriation is eliminated. At present I only desire to state that the joint resolution has been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. That committee has acted on the same and reported it to the House, and this rule brings up that joint resolution as reported by that committee. Mr. Speaker, I think that the report of the committee is practically unanimous, and therefore there is nothing else that I can add at this time that would enlighten the House. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the eliminations that have been made in the resolution, I am still opposed to it for reasons given on a prior day when the matter was under consideration in the House. I do not care to add at this time to the objections I then made to the resolution, and will now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I do not like to fight, and I never do unless I have to or unless I am performing a public service. I dislike very much to disagree with the majority, or with the members of the committee of which I am a member, but I feel called upon to do it in this instance, and also to vote against the special committee of the House or a majority of that committee from my side of the House. It is true that this resolution has been amended a little. They tried here the other day to lead in this Trojan horse in its worst form. The House refused to even consider the resolution as it was reported by the Committee on Rules, and introduced into this House by the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. They have taken this Trojan horse out, and they think they have sheared him until they have disguised him, and now they try to lead him into the city from another angle; but I want to say to the Members of this House that it is the same proposition to-day that it was when it was originally introduced into this House, and I want to say to some of you Democrats who stood up and voted your convictions here the other day and voted against this rule, who have for one reason or another allowed yourselves to be picked off, and who are going to vote to-day to adopt this rule, which means that this resolution will be adopted, that this fight has just begun. When you vote to report this Newlands resolution, when you vote to give that committee further life—a committee that has been in operation for more than seven months, which has examined one witness fully and three partially—you are voting for a proposition that the men who are behind it, the men who are the prime movers of this thing, admit is nothing less than an effort to take the control of transportation facilities entirely out of the hands of the States.

I want some of you gentlemen who have been howling around here about State rights to hear this. The very object of the Newlands committee, acknowledged by the men who are behind it, who are the fathers of it, is to destroy every right that the State now has and has ever had in the transportation question in this country. Who is behind it? Who has been up here calling out Members of this House and asking them to change their votes on this proposition and to adopt this rule? One eminent gentleman, able lawyer, general counsel for the Southern Railway, general counsel for the railway managers of the country, and when he speaks he speaks for 82 per cent of the mileage, called a Member of this House out, and made the statement before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which I shall relate. This gentleman asked, in substance, "What is your object in wanting this resolution adopted and this committee continued?" He replied, in substance, "My object is that I believe I can take my experts before that committee, that I can make that committee believe—perhaps not some other committee—but I can make that committee believe and recommend the absolute destruction of the rights of the States to control in transportation matters in this country." That is his object. He has shown a greater zeal in this matter than anyone else. It is said by those who advocate this measure that they have stricken one Member off this committee who will not be a Member of the next Congress, and that for that reason it is a great and good resolution. Mr. Speaker, I had as soon Judge CULLOR would help enact this farce as anyone. Let us see what this resolution contains. This committee has been in operation now for seven months, almost. This committee was to report back here the 8th of January. Nobody has seen any report, they have nothing to report. It is a do-nothing resolution, and its purpose is to kill legislation in this House that will be remedial. That is the object of the prime movers of this legislation, and there can be no question about that. They have had seven months in which to investigate the subject, and they have examined one witness fully and two or three more partially, and yet they want more time in which to investigate, and what have they got to investigate? Under the resolution they are—

To investigate the subject of the Government control and regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, the efficiency of the existing system in protecting the rights of shippers and carriers and in promoting the public interest, the incorporation or control of the incorporation of carriers, and all proposed changes in the organization of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the act to regulate commerce.

That is a part of what they have to investigate within 30 days. Also—

The subject of Government ownership of all public utilities, such as telegraph, wireless, cable, telephone, express companies, and railroads engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, and report as to the wisdom or feasibility of Government ownership of such utilities and as to the comparative worth and efficiency of Government regulation and control as compared with Government ownership and operation.

They have to investigate all this within 30 or 40 days, and they are to have authority to sit during the recess of Congress.

They have examined one witness in seven months, yet they claim they can investigate all of the acts to regulate commerce and everything in connection with interstate transportation, and Government ownership of every transportation facility as compared with private ownership. This resolution, I say to you to-day, has been held up in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; it has been held up on the floor every time a Member has tried to get up anything that would amend the interstate-commerce act. They have not investigated one subject named in the resolution in seven months, and they will not if you will give the railroads and some members of the committee all the time they want. They will not complete this investigation in seven years, and this resolution to extend this committee does not stop this thing. When Congress meets next December, they will be in here again wanting to extend this committee. The Interstate Commerce Commission down here, a body of patriotic men trying to perform a great public service, come into this Congress each year with recommendations and say, "We can not perform our functions as public officials and as servants of the people unless you give us added law"; but when you introduce a bill—when you want to give the Interstate Commerce Commission the power they did not have in connection with the Louisville & Nashville case, to go into the records of that railroad prior to the effective date of the Hepburn Act, which was 1910—when you want to go into the correspondence of that railroad company, which the railroad company says you can not go into because it is not authorized by law, and when you attempt to cure that evil, as I have done, and try to get it up on the floor of the House, or when I try to pass it through the committee, I am met with the assertion that nothing ought to be done until this Newlands thing reports. When will it report? Will it be next week, or will it be next year, or will it be when we are bound hand and foot by the railroad corporations of this country? That is when it will be. But they say that I have introduced the bill and that I am talking about State regulation and State control when I have introduced a bill and had it reported from the committee that would give the Interstate Commerce Commission the power of veto over new issue of stocks and bonds, and take that away from the States. It is proper that the Interstate Commerce Commission should have that power. I am not fighting the State commissions when I advocate that.

The National Association of State Railroad Commissions in their last annual convention made nine recommendations to this Congress, and the only one of the nine recommendations upon which they united was that Congress should pass a law giving the Interstate Commerce Commission power to regulate the issuance of stocks and bonds of this country. They themselves did not believe that that would be an invasion of their rights. Simply because my State and a great many other States have effective laws for the regulation of these issues of stocks and bonds by the railroads of that State, and my State has a clean railroad system that is causing every railroad that comes through the State to reincorporate within the State and to come before the commission, before they can burden themselves and the public with new issues of stocks and bonds, and other States do not have them, the railroad corporations of my State, clean and well managed, are mulcted of their substance for the benefit of railroads in other States where they can charge a rate that is unreasonable. And yet they come in here and say they intend to report this back in 30 or 40 days, and everybody knows it is one of the most tremendous and most far-reaching questions ever considered by any Congress, and they have not considered one case in seven months. I said here in December that the Newlands resolution was "chloroform." I repeat that statement. I do not mean to charge that the chairman of this committee, for whom I have the highest regard and the greatest affection, as being a party to that intentionally, but he has been used that way, I am sorry to say. You can pass this thing if you want to. This is progressive legislation, progressing backward several years, because every man who wants to do anything in this Congress or out of it with respect or in reference to the railroads of this country is told to wait, wait, wait until this Newlands committee shall report. I hope and I trust the Members on this side of the House who stood up the other day and voted their convictions will not be terrorized to-day, and if they do vote their convictions to-day this thing will meet the same fate it met last week. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON].

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, it is easily judged from the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN], who has just addressed the House, that he is against

this proposition [laughter], and being against it, his inventive genius can supply him with many suggestions, sound and unsound. The truth is that the President of the United States came before this body at the beginning of this Congress and recommended a general investigation of the conditions of transportation. Both Houses of Congress agreed to his proposition. Before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce reported the resolution, however, we had the railroad advocates to come before us and show their hands and in our printed hearings disclose what their proposition was. We went to work as soon as Congress adjourned, but Congress did not adjourn as soon as we expected. We had hoped that it would adjourn early in the summer and permit us to investigate those propositions. It adjourned, however, so late and the election came so early that we could not get to work until the 20th of November. We heard the railroads' case and we have not completed the cross-examination by which we hope to bring—I think the majority of the committee does—the same confusion to the railroads' case that the gentleman from Texas himself is advocating. Not all of the 10 members of that joint committee are servitors of the corporations. They are representatives of the people and they are trying to find out and present to the people evidence of what the truth is. We could write our individual reports right now, but we would like to complete the testimony, let both sides be heard, and let the people read the evidence on both sides and judge whether the railroads' claims ought to be adopted or whether we ought to go on as we have been doing, trying to improve the present system under which we have proceeded for years—

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAMSON. I will.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman give for my information, and I suppose others, some idea as to when it will be possible for the gentleman's committee to make a report?

Mr. ADAMSON. We could make a report right now, but we would like to finish the cross-examination of witnesses who have testified direct, only four of them, not one as the gentleman stated, but four very important witnesses.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I will say, with all due respect to the gentleman, that that is entirely an evasion.

Mr. ADAMSON. Not at all.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Certainly the chairman has some idea as to when his committee will report.

Mr. ADAMSON. I have stated in this House twice that, in my opinion, 40 days' work will complete it. Now, Mr. Speaker, when Congress met, the 10 members of that joint committee found themselves not only active Members of the two Houses, but active members of committees, and it was impossible for them to do two things at once and do justice to either. Therefore, contrary to the opinion of the gentleman from Texas, we made a formal report to Congress, as required in the original resolution, stated the facts, and requested an extension of time. We have worked as hard as we could, but we were not able to do justice to the subject by reason of the limited time and we ask for further time. We do not ask for an additional appropriation, we do not ask for anything except to extend the time in which we may complete the examination and make our report.

We have eliminated the proposition objectionable to some gentlemen the other day, of continuing the services of men on the committee after they had ceased to be Members of Congress. So the sole proposition in the resolution that has come here from the Senate and been reported back by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is to permit us to finish the job which it was impossible for us to complete without neglecting our important duties during the session of Congress. We have set until the 1st day of next December, but we will not expend any more money. We will do the work within the limits prescribed. We are avoiding all unnecessary expense. We are doing our best to verify our opinions with the evidence of some people; people who know something about it or profess to know something about it. We can write our own opinions and say that we know all about it now, but that is not what we were appointed to do. We can give our opinions as Members of the House. We are appointed to hear the people who profess to know something about it, and, after hearing and investigating, then report what we find from the facts.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, it was unnecessary to accuse anybody of being the servitors of corporations, because we are willing to turn the flood of daylight upon the whole matter. I am perfectly willing to risk the pushing of any centralization on me. I do not think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] can teach me anything about the rights of local self-government and honest government in this country. I think there are men on that committee able to bring out the contrary

of anything that is wrong that anybody can bring out. And I will say to the gentlemen here, while there are three or four men there who have foolish ideas of national incorporation as a remedy for all things and certain things for breaking down State lines and local self-government, I think a great majority of us feel we are called to combat that proposition, and when there are any witnesses there to tell the truth, we will bring it out, and those who want good regulation I do not think need fear the efforts of that committee. I do not think the committee will ever recommend turning over the States bottom upward. We are in favor of maintaining the Government and maintaining the transportation systems and taking care of the shipper, and doing everything right, and we want to hear and report the truth to this House. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Seven minutes.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch] is recognized for four minutes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the original Newlands resolution was inspired by the President's message delivered to the joint Houses in December, 1915. As a result of that message that resolution was introduced and was adopted and became a law in July last year. The interval between its adoption and the beginning of this session was too short for the subcommittee appointed under its provisions to make more than a preliminary survey. So far, therefore, as the other side of this Chamber is concerned, they can justify the adoption of this rule and resolution based upon the message of the President of December, 1915. This side of the Chamber has concern in this proposition by reason of a plank inserted in the Republican platform at Chicago last June, which reads as follows, and I read it because so few of the membership on this side of the House remember that such a plank was adopted. It says:

Interstate and intrastate transportation have become so interwoven that the attempt to apply two and often several sets of laws to its regulation has produced conflicts of authority, embarrassment in operation, and inconvenience and expense to the public.

The entire transportation system of the country has become essentially national. We, therefore, favor such action by legislation or, if necessary, through an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will result in placing it under complete Federal control.

That plank presents a proposition which has never been considered by a committee of Congress. And it is of sufficient importance to warrant a serious and careful investigation. I do not at this time express my views thereon. I will openly and willingly receive any testimony that may enlighten me, and that ought to be the attitude of the subcommittee, and it ought to be the attitude of Congress.

I have no sympathy with the self-sufficiency which characterizes some of the Members of this House when they say that we can not be enlightened upon these complicated questions of interstate traffic; that if we need information we can get it from governmental authorities. I am one who believes there are many men in this country who can give valuable information under the Newlands resolution if we will only hear them. This will not be an expensive proposition. We modestly ask for \$24,000 to investigate the whole subject of transportation, to cover a field broader than has ever been intrusted for investigation to any committee of Congress, and we are to-day, under this resolution, to report at the first meeting in December next. Other commissions have been appointed, committees of inquiry that have cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, and their field of inquiry was comparatively small and narrow compared with the field of inquiry to which this committee has been asked to direct its attention.

I have some sympathy with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] because of this resolution. He has been disappointed in failing to get consideration of his stock-and-bond bill. I helped him get it through the last Congress, I helped him report it out in this Congress, and I am ready to vote for it whenever an opportunity is presented. And let me remind him that whenever it was brought up on the Unanimous Consent Calendar no member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce opposed or objected to its consideration. It is not the membership of this committee to which has been intrusted the duty of making this investigation that stands as a buffer to the stock-and-bond bill. There are some other gentlemen in this House that have offered opposition. The gentleman from Texas ought not be disappointed in his failure to get action on his stock-and-bond bill. The longer he serves in this House the more of such disappointments he will have. Why, I remember bringing legislative children into this House for adoption only to find that they were soon absolutely kid-

napped and appeared under the name of a foster parent in a subsequent Congress. [Laughter and applause.] Yet that does not deter me from continuing to support any legislation or investigation that will give to this country a better transportation system.

The gentleman from Texas is grieved possibly because of the Shreveport decision which was issued by the commission and sustained by the United States Supreme Court. And let me say to this House that the Shreveport decision is one that will give ever-increasing trouble and difficulty to the Interstate Commerce Commission unless we can find some way of settling these controversies. I am for a committee that will investigate these subjects. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, there are only three points to which I wish to address myself. In the first place, I desire to say that fundamentally I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

The SPEAKER. The Chair will say to the gentleman that he has the right to close. Does the gentleman from Kansas want any time?

Mr. HENRY. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I thought it had been used.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How much time have I, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Five minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, with reference to the quotation from the Republican platform that my colleague [Mr. Esch] has just made, I want to say that any Member who considers that plank as binding upon him should know it can not in any way affect the question now before the House, because any Member who does consider it binding upon him does not need any investigation by any committee to enable him to determine whether there shall be complete Federal control over the railroads; and as to any Member on this side of the House who does not consider that plank binding upon him, it of course has no bearing whatever upon this question.

Now, the distinguished chairman of the committee has corroborated the statement that I made when this resolution—or practically this resolution—was before the House the other day. I stated then that the members of this subcommittee were better qualified to make recommendations to this House and pass upon this question than any witness that had been called before that committee or any witness that would likely be called before that committee. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ADAMSON], the chairman of the committee, has just stated to the House that that committee was now ready and prepared to write their report to this House, which meant, if it meant anything, that that committee did not need any further information; and he stated that the only purpose of continuing this committee was for the purpose of enabling that committee to cross-examine the representatives of the railroads who had appeared before them and confuse and confound them.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I will yield for a question.

Mr. ADAMSON. The only difficult is that, while we members of the committee admit the truth of the gentleman's compliment, the balance of the people who pass on the fight may not agree with us.

Mr. LENROOT. I was just coming to that; and I submit this, that every Member of this House who has had any experience with those investigations will bear me out in the assertion that in the case of investigations of this character, involving many volumes of testimony, if it is not for the benefit of the members of the committee having the matter in charge it is not for the benefit of anybody else, because the percentage of Members of this House who read these volumes of testimony, outside of the members of the committee, is so small that it would have to be indicated by decimal figures.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I expect that this resolution will be adopted, not upon its merits, because upon the principal part of it the merits of it are the same to-day as they were last week; but it is expected that it will be adopted because the executive officers of this Government have been busy since this resolution was defeated last week and have importuned Members of Congress to change their votes; and it is expected that they will do so.

Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the representatives of the great railroads of this country have been busy with Members of this House—not illegitimately, of course—but they have been

busy with the Members of this House since this resolution was defeated last week, and it is expected that their influence will be sufficient to change enough votes to-day to adopt this resolution now.

And I say here and now if this resolution is adopted to-day it will be not upon its merits, but it will be because of the importunities of the administrative officers of this Government and the importunities of the representatives of the great railroads of this country, who well know their purposes in continuing this committee, and their purposes are not in the public interest.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. If I have any time.

Mr. BORLAND. I do not know that the gentleman stated, but is he in favor of national control of railroads?

Mr. LENROOT. That question is not before us now. I want to say with reference to that does the gentleman mean exclusive national control?

Mr. BORLAND. Yes; exclusive national control.

Mr. LENROOT. I will meet that question when it is before the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, there are three phases of this question to which I wish to address myself. In the first place, I desire to say that fundamentally I agree with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. I am not in favor of the exclusive Federal control or Federal chartering of the transportation facilities of this country. For one I believe in the integrity and in the powers of the various State railroad commissions, and I hope that they will be preserved by Congress as well as by the respective States.

It is not inappropriate for me to say here—and I hope I speak it with proper authority—that the President believed that he had good reasons when he asked Congress to continue this commission for a while longer. I know nothing about the railroad presidents who have been importuning Members of Congress. They have not importuned me. But, Mr. Speaker, here is the President of the United States endeavoring to deal with a great transportation problem, and I believe we will all concede that he is striving to do it in an honest and upright way. He asks Congress for a little further time in aiding him to make this investigation.

Now, some gentlemen on this side objected to this resolution, because it had within its provisions a clause that would continue in office a Member who had not been reelected to Congress. That clause is stricken out; that objection no longer obtains, and I think those gentlemen who voted against the resolution on that ground will concede, upon reflection, that they ought to comply with this request of the President of the United States. I think the gentlemen on that side will agree to that. We are all trying to arrive at a correct conclusion about this great problem, which must be settled by the Congress of the United States and the various States of the Union.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I have not time.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I wanted to ask how the President made this request?

Mr. HENRY. I am glad to answer that. I think it is proper for me to state that the President made a personal request of me, as the chairman of the Committee on Rules, to lay this matter before the House after the committee had taken action, if they acceded to his views, and he has made the request in a message, as I understand; but I think it has been done in polite and respectful terms, and for one I always respect a request like that. It has not been my privilege always to agree with the President, and I do not know that I will agree with him about this question. I prefer to stand for the same thing that my friend and colleague from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] stands for in regard to the power and life of the railroad commissions of the States being maintained as they are. But I have not arrived at that stage of my reasoning where I am willing to say to a committee that has taken only part of the testimony that now they shall not take the other part and develop the very proposition in which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] and myself are vitally interested. I believe this case should be completed, and therefore I urge the adoption of the rule and the passage of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the rule.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. HENRY) there were—ayes 83, noes 59.

Mr. HILLIARD. The yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado demands the yeas and nays.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama makes the point that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not, but the Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and seventy-nine Members, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 219, nays 126, answered "present" 3, not voting 85, as follows:

YEAS—219.

Abercrombie	Dupré	Keating	Rogers
Adair	Eagan	Kettner	Roase
Adamson	Eagle	Key, Ohio	Hubey
Alexander	Edmonds	King	Rucker
Allen	Esch	Kitchin	Russell, Mo.
Almon	Evans	Lazaro	Sabath
Ashbrook	Farley	Lee	Saunders
Aswell	Ferris	Leshner	Sears
Barkley	Fess	Lewis	Shackleford
Barnhart	Fields	Lindbergh	Shallenberger
Bell	Flood	Linthicum	Sherley
Black	Foster	Littlepage	Shouse
Blackmon	Freeman	Lloyd	Sims
Booher	Gallagher	London	Sinnott
Borland	Gallivan	McAndrews	Sisson
Browne	Gandy	McClintic	Small
Bruckner	Gard	McDermott	Smith, Idaho
Buchanan, Tex.	Garner	McGillcuddy	Smith, N. Y.
Burgess	Garrett	McKellar	Smith, Tex.
Burke	Gillett	McKinley	Steagall
Burnett	Glass	McLemore	Stedman
Butler	Glynn	Maher	Steele, Iowa
Byrnes, S. C.	Godwin, N. C.	Martin	Stephens, Miss.
Caldwell	Good	Mays	Stephens, Nebr.
Candler, Miss.	Goodwin, Ark.	Miller, Pa.	Stephens, Tex.
Cantrill	Gordon	Montague	Sterling
Caraway	Gray, Ala.	Moon	Stone
Carlin	Green, Iowa	Moore, Pa.	Stout
Carter, Okla.	Gregg	Morgan, Okla.	Summers
Church	Hamilton, Mich.	Morrison	Taggart
Clark, Fla.	Hamlin	Moss	Tague
Coady	Hardy	Murray	Talbot
Coleman	Harrison, Miss.	Neely	Tayner
Collier	Harrison, Va.	Neison	Taylor, Ark.
Connelly	Hastings	Nicholls, S. C.	Temple
Conry	Hayden	Nichols, Mich.	Thomas
Cooper, Ohio	Heflin	Onkey	Thompson
Cooper, Wis.	Helgesen	Oglesby	Tillman
Costello	Helm	Oliver	Tilson
Cox	Helvering	Olney	Towner
Crago	Henry	O'Shaunessy	Van Dyke
Crisp	Hensley	Overmyer	Vare
Crosser	Holland	Padgett	Venable
Darrow	Hollingsworth	Palge, Mass.	Vinson
Davis, Tex.	Hood	Park	Walker
Decker	Howard	Phelan	Watkins
Dent	Hughes	Price	Watson, Va.
Dickinson	Hulbert	Quinn	Whaley
Dill	Hull, Tenn.	Rainey	Williams, W. E.
Dixon	Humphreys, Miss.	Raker	Wilson, La.
Dooling	Igoe	Ramseyer	Winslow
Doolittle	Jacoway	Randall	Wise
Doremus	Johnson, Ky.	Rauch	Young, Tex.
Doughton	Jones	Reilly	

NAYS—126.

Anderson	Fuller	Kincheioe	Roberts, Nev.
Austin	Gardner	Kinkaid	Rowe
Bacharach	Garland	La Follette	Scott, Mich.
Bailey	Gould	Langley	Sells
Benedict	Gray, Ind.	Leibach	Slayden
Britt	Gray, N. J.	Lenroot	Sloan
Britten	Greene, Mass.	Longworth	Smith, Mich.
Browning	Greene, Vt.	Loud	Snell
Buchanan, Ill.	Griest	McArthur	Snyder
Cannon	Hadley	McKenzie	Stafford
Capstick	Haskell	McLaughlin	Steenerson
Carter, Mass.	Haugen	Madden	Stiness
Chandler, N. Y.	Hawley	Magee	Sulloway
Chipfield	Hayes	Mann	Sweet
Cooper, W. Va.	Heaton	Mapes	Switzer
Cramton	Hicks	Mathews	Taylor, Colo.
Curry	Hillard	Meeker	Timberlake
Dale, Vt.	Hinds	Miller, Del.	Tinkham
Dallinger	Hopwood	Mondell	Treadway
Danforth	Huddleston	Moore, Ind.	Volstead
Dempsey	Hull, Iowa	Morin	Walsh
Denison	Humphrey, Wash.	Mott	Ward
Dillon	Hutchinson	Mudd	Wason
Dowell	James	Nolan	Wheeler
Drukker	Johnson, S. Dak.	North	Williams, Ohio
Dunn	Johnson, Wash.	Page, N. C.	Wingo
Dyer	Kahn	Parker, N. J.	Wood, Ind.
Ellsworth	Kearns	Platt	Woods, Iowa
Elston	Keister	Powers	Woodyard
Emerson	Kelley	Rayburn	Young, N. Dak.
Focht	Kennedy, Iowa	Reavis	
Frear	Kennedy, R. I.	Ricketts	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Bennet

Campbell

Cline

NOT VOTING—85.

Aiken
Anthony
Ayres
Barchfield
Beakes
Beales

Bowers
Brumbaugh
Callaway
Carew
Cary
Casey

Charles
Copley
Cullop
Dale, N. Y.
Davenport
Davis, Minn.

Dewalt
Dies
Driscoll
Edwards
Estopinal
Fairchild

Finley	Kent	Oldfield	Scully
Fitzgerald	Kless, Pa.	Parker, N. Y.	Siegel
Flynn	Konop	Patten	Slemp
Fordney	Kreider	Peters	Smith, Minn.
Foss	Lafean	Porter	Sparkman
Graham	Lieb	Pou	Steele, Pa.
Griffin	Liebel	Pratt	Sutherland
Guernsey	Lobeck	Ragsdale	Swift
Hamill	Loft	Riordan	Watson, Pa.
Hamilton, N. Y.	McCracken	Roberts, Mass.	Webb
Hart	McCulloch	Rodenberg	Williams, T. S.
Hernandez	McFadden	Rowland	Wilson, Fla.
Hill	Miller, Minn.	Russell, Ohio	Wilson, Ill.
Houston	Mooney	Sanford	
Howell	Morgan, La.	Schall	
Husted	Norton	Scott, Pa.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. DEWALT with Mr. FORDNEY.

Mr. AYRES with Mr. McCULLOCH.

Mr. POU with Mr. LAFEAN.

Mr. LOFT with Mr. MCCracken.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. WILSON of Florida with Mr. SUTHERLAND.

Mr. LIEBEL with Mr. PARKER of New York.

Mr. AIKEN with Mr. COPLEY.

Mr. STEELE of Pennsylvania with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.

Mr. LOBECK with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. OLDFIELD with Mr. RODENBERG.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. MORGAN of Louisiana with Mr. PRATT.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. CARY.

Mr. LIEB with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.

Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. FLYNN with Mr. HILL.

Mr. EDWARDS with Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. DAVENPORT with Mr. FOSS.

Mr. CULLOP with Mr. BOWERS.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS.

Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. PORTER.

Mr. BEAKES with Mr. SANFORD.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FITZGERALD with Mr. SLEMP.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. SIEGEL.

Mr. KONOP with Mr. SWIFT.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. SCHALL.

Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. ANTHONY.

Mr. CAREW with Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. KLESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HART with Mr. MCFADDEN.

Mr. DIES with Mr. HUSTED.

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. GUERNSEY.

Mr. DALE of New York with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. CASEY with Mr. FAIRCHILD.

On this vote:

Mr. PATTEN (for) with Mr. BENNET (against).

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

A quorum being present, the doors were opened.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, when this resolution (S. J. Res. 190; H. Rept. 1269) is laid before the House and read I shall ask that general debate be dispensed with and that a vote be taken. I think it has been discussed by all Members who wish to discuss it.

The SPEAKER. The rule provides that the first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with.

Mr. ADAMSON. I ask unanimous consent that general debate be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that all general debate be dispensed with. The Chair would like to inquire who has the engrossed copy of the bill? The Chair supposed that the one the Clerk had was the engrossed copy, but it seems that it is not.

Mr. MANN. Of course, we can not proceed without the engrossed copy.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask if the request of the gentleman from Georgia will affect the right to offer amendments?

The SPEAKER. The rule says that amendments shall be offered during general debate.

Mr. BLACK. I shall have to object to the gentleman's request if it does.

Mr. ADAMSON. I have no objection to the gentleman offering his amendment now.

Mr. BLACK. Then I will offer an amendment.

Mr. ADAMSON. The only purport of my request is to dispense with general debate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that if general debate is dispensed with the bill ought to be read for amendment.

Mr. MANN. But under the rule, Mr. Speaker, the bill can not be read for amendment. It is a foolish, useless, unnecessary, and almost criminal provision that amendments can be offered only in general debate.

Mr. ADAMSON. I made my request plain enough, and I do not object to amendments being offered now and disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The trouble is that the rule provides that there shall be an hour of general debate, or not exceeding one hour, and that during this general debate amendments may be offered.

Mr. ADAMSON. My request for unanimous consent is to dispense with the debate, and gentlemen may be recognized to offer amendments in any way they choose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent that general debate be dispensed with and that anybody who wishes to offer an amendment may do so.

Mr. BLACK. I shall have to object, Mr. Speaker, unless I have the right to discuss my amendment.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, does not the rule provide for offering amendments?

The SPEAKER. It provides that amendments may be offered during general debate.

Mr. ADAMSON. Unless we can reach some agreement, Mr. Speaker, I shall have to withdraw my request.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. BORLAND. I rise to ask the chairman whether it would not suit his purpose to ask unanimous consent that the general debate provided for by the rule be dispensed with and that the resolution be read for amendment under the five-minute rule.

Mr. MANN. I should object to that. Nobody is required to talk on the resolution if he does not wish to.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 10, after the word "seventeen," insert the following: "Provided, That so much of said S. J. Res. 60 (Public Res. No. 25, 64th Cong.), approved July 20, 1916, as authorizes and empowers said joint subcommittee to investigate the subject of Government ownership of all public utilities, such as telegraph, wireless, cable, telephone, express companies, or railroads engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, and report as to the wisdom or feasibility of Government ownership of such utilities, be, and the same is hereby, repealed."

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. I will.

Mr. MANN. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. We do not have the Senate resolution in print, so far as I know. Is it the same as the substitute reported by the committee to the House?

Mr. ADAMSON. Yes; it is identical. I thought it was printed. It was referred to our committee and reported back.

Mr. MANN. It may be printed, but I have not seen it.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday we had a rule before the House somewhat similar to the one we have voted on this afternoon, except that the rule we were then called upon to adopt made in order a resolution which would have continued as a member of this subcommittee a Member of Congress whose term of office will expire March 4, 1917, and provided an additional appropriation. The resolution which we now have before us and to which I have offered the amendment just read does not do that. If this resolution that we now have before us is adopted, it will authorize the continuance of the life of the Newlands-Adamson subcommittee. That committee, as we have already understood from the discussion on the floor of the House, consists of five Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce and five Members of the House who are members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. This subcommittee is proceeding under a resolution adopted July 20, 1916, part of which I will take the time to read in order that Members who have not read the resolution may be familiar with its contents.

That resolution is as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate and the Committee of the House of Representatives on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, through a joint subcommittee to consist of five Senators and five Representatives, who shall be selected by said committees, respectively, be, and they hereby are, appointed to investigate the subject of the Government control and regulation of interstate and foreign transportation, the efficiency of the existing system in protecting the rights of shippers and carriers and in promoting the public interest, the incorporation or control of the incorporation of carriers, and all proposed changes in the organization of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the act to regulate commerce, also the subject of Government ownership of all public utilities, such as telegraph, wireless, cable, telephone, express companies, and railroads engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, and report as to the wisdom or feasibility of Government ownership of such utilities and as to the comparative worth and efficiency of Government regulation and control as compared

with Government ownership and operation, with authority to sit during the recess of Congress and with power to summon witnesses, to administer oaths, and to require the various departments, commissions, and other Government agencies of the United States to furnish such information and render such assistance as may, in the judgment of the joint subcommittee, be deemed desirable, to appoint necessary experts, clerks, and stenographers, and to do whatever is necessary for a full and comprehensive examination and study of the subject and report to Congress on or before the second Monday in January, 1917; that the sum of \$24,000, or so much thereof as is necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution and to pay the necessary expenses of the subcommittee and its members, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. Said appropriation shall be immediately available and shall be paid out on the audit and order of the chairman or acting chairman of said subcommittee, which audit and order shall be conclusive and binding upon all departments as to the correctness of the accounts of such subcommittee.

Approved, July 20, 1916.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the effect of the amendment which I have offered, and which I hope will be adopted by this House, is to repeal that provision of the resolution which gives this committee authority and empowers it to investigate the subject of Government ownership of all public utilities, such as telegraph, wireless, cable, telephone, and express companies, and railroads engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, and report as to the wisdom or feasibility of Government ownership of such utilities. Mr. Speaker, as one Democrat who I hope still entertains some allegiance to the time-honored doctrines of our party, I am opposed to the Government ownership of railroads, telegraph and telephone lines, and other doctrine of that kind. [Applause.] I am opposed to this Democratic House of Representatives deliberately authorizing the committee to encumber the records of this House with an investigation on those subjects. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman just spend a few minutes of his time in rehearsing some of those time-honored principles which he is talking about?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I have never known the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS] to be an exponent of very many of them. [Applause and laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to continue for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I have the kindest personal regard for my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, but I can remember when, as a champion of the Populist Party in the days gone by, he was preaching this doctrine of Government ownership of railroads throughout the district which I have the honor to represent. As a Democrat I was against such doctrine then, and I am still against it. Mr. Speaker, the situation which confronts this country is not the question of Government ownership of these public utilities, but it is the question as to how they ought to be regulated and controlled and made to serve the people's interest, and I believe that ought to be the investigation task of this committee.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Is the gentleman afraid that this committee will make him change his views? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLACK. I am not; but I do not wish the Democratic Party to be placed in the attitude of giving sanction to the socialistic doctrine of general Government ownership of railroads, and so forth. [Applause.]

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing disposition in this country, every time anything goes wrong in any private enterprise, for some men to forthwith rise up and say, "Let the Government buy it and run it." I have never seen anything which leads me to believe that the Federal Government has demonstrated any conspicuous business ability in the conduct of its affairs. My observation leads me to quite a contrary belief. Now, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, does not the gentleman think there is quite a distinction between giving sanction to a thing in advance and hearing a discussion about it?

Mr. BLACK. I will say in answer to the gentleman that I do not think we ought to fritter away the time of this committee in a useless investigation of that kind. I believe that the task of this committee ought to be to investigate such questions as the incorporation or control of the incorporation of carriers, the efficiency of the existing system in protecting the rights of shippers and carriers, and in promoting the public interest, and all proposed changes in the organization of the Interstate Commerce Commission. These, I think, are the kind

of subjects that this committee should be directed by this House to investigate, and not waste any of its time investigating the question of Government ownership of railroads, express companies, telegraph and telephone lines, and so forth. The country needs and ought to have some such relief as would be provided by the bill that my friend from Texas, Mr. RAYBURN, has introduced, which, in substance, gives the Federal Government the control of the issuance of the stocks and bonds and other securities of these railroads. [Applause.] I believe that the time has come when the people are entitled to a square deal in this matter, and they are not receiving it so long as the public are paying freight on fictitious valuations and watered stock. The stockholders of these corporations are not receiving a square deal so long as stock is sold them which does not represent honest value, and it is time that the American Congress set to work and devoted its attention to the real task at hand of correcting some of these known evils, instead of chasing off after some will-o-the-wisp, and I hope that this amendment which I have offered will be adopted. [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS of Texas rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. To discuss this amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to it?

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. What authority has the Speaker to say that the gentleman is recognized for five minutes?

The SPEAKER. Because the rule says that amendments shall be debated for five minutes on a side.

Mr. MANN. The rule says that?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks so.

Mr. MANN. I think not. The rule says that there shall be an hour of debate, 30 minutes on a side.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is aware that the special rule says that.

Mr. MANN. This is all general debate.

The SPEAKER. General debate for an hour.

Mr. MANN. Thirty minutes on a side.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. MANN. I do not think the Speaker has any right to limit the time. I call attention to it simply to show how foolish the rule is.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not passing upon the wisdom of the rule. The Chair was talking about general debate. This rule provides for an hour of general debate, 30 minutes to be allotted to those who favor it and 30 minutes to be allotted to those who are against it. From which side is the time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS] to be taken?

Mr. MANN. He has to determine that. I do not know. God forbid that I should speak for him. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The language is apparent that he can not speak over 30 minutes. The Chair was wrong about the 5 minutes.

Mr. OGLESBY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. OGLESBY. My question is on this point: Is not, as a matter of fact, this gentleman speaking to the amendment and not on the proposition?

The SPEAKER. Of course, the special rule provided that amendments should be offered during general debate, but it does not provide they should be offered at any other time.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is the gentleman from Texas recognized for 30 minutes or such part as he desires to use?

Mr. MANN. He must be if nobody else wants to be recognized.

The SPEAKER. Well, it seems to the Chair that that suggestion is correct. Whether anybody else wants to debate or not, the Chair does not know.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NEELY. It is perfectly clear we could stop the gentleman at the end of 30 minutes, is it not?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not speak on one side more than 30 minutes. [Laughter and applause.] The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have stood all this time like a lamb dumb before the shearer. Now, I certainly see no objection to inquiring into all the whys and wherefores involved in the proper regulation, control, and management of the great

railroad lines of this country, and I am simply standing by the resolution that passed the Senate and was brought over to this body by recommendation of our President, and I voted for the resolution with the understanding that we were to go into every element involved in the case, and I have no objection to having the entire facts. We have it in the sworn records of this company that a man by the name of Mellen stood and paid out something like \$70,000,000 in one day to persons he did not know, had never seen, and for something he had no idea of its value, and under similar process charged stupendous sums against one of the great railroads of this country to be levied upon the industry of even the unborn generations by the railroad managers of this country. We have in the sworn records that men in the management of railroad systems have builded feeders and subsidiary lines up into the millions of dollars' worth, doubled and trebled the stock and bonds of those subsidiary lines, sold to themselves at two and a half and up to five times the cost of production and charged it up to the parent company, put the millions of cash in their pockets, and levied that tribute upon the commerce of this country, a fixed charge against traffic for the next 50 to 75 years. I could go on for two hours and give you the history of these matters, but it is not necessary. This is an administration measure. The scope of this resolution is to investigate all these problems. I had it thrown into my face when I was in the campaign by at least a dozen Republicans where I spoke that we had acted hastily when we passed the eight-hour law, and they asked why we did not wait and investigate. I looked them in the face and said that we felt like the house was on fire, and we had to put out the fire first and investigate later as to who started the fire. [Applause.] I told them the President was willing to investigate, to spend plenty of time investigating—

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. I yielded a good deal of time when I stood in silence, I am talking now.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Will the gentleman from Missouri pocket his smile and sit quiet awhile? I said I was perfectly willing to continue the investigation. Why? To see if there is any decent method on God Almighty's earth to explain why they let men literally rob the New Haven & Hartford Railroad, like robbing a bee gum, and pocket millions. I said I was perfectly willing to have them explain how Mr. Gould's system could pay \$5,000,000 for a man to stand by the side of one female member of his family in Europe and become her husband and charge it up to the Missouri Pacific line and run it into bankruptcy, and then pay \$3,000,000 to get loose from him and charge that up to another Pacific system and run it into bankruptcy. [Applause.] I am perfectly willing for all these matters to be explained. I could go on for an hour and ask for explanations of all these lines that have been filched. I am speaking for the unborn. [Applause.] Now, I just want to look at my very excellent young friend over here, Mr. BLACK, who taunted me with the statement that he had never known me to stand for many of the time-honored doctrines of Democracy. I took nine volumes of Thomas Jefferson (congressional edition), went all over this Republic defending those doctrines, and I helped to write the first national demand for an income-tax law ever put into a national platform in the United States, and the gentleman was in knee breeches then. [Applause.] I helped write the first national platform that was ever made demanding the direct election of United States Senators, and advocated these all over this country with Bryan and other glorious Democrats.

I helped to write into a national platform in the State of Oregon the first demand for the initiative, referendum, and recall, and volunteered my services and went back there and made 60 speeches when we adopted it in that State, and we worked that principle of Democracy so well that we made a Republican legislature send a good Democratic Senator to the United States Senate, thank God! [Applause on the Democratic side.] And the gentleman from my district was living in ease and luxuriance, quietly rusticated, and now taunts me with the statement that I never stood for many of the time-honored principles. I challenge him to point out one plank in the Democratic platform I did not stand for 25 years ago. I volunteered my services, and when Mr. Bryan was nominated in 1900 I was commissioned by J. G. Johnson, of Kansas; "Jim" Jones, of Arkansas; and Marion Butler, of North Carolina, the three national chairmen, for five months to organize the Silver Republicans, Populists, and Bryan Democrats into clubs. I made 300 speeches and traveled 46,000 miles by rail. What was the gentleman from my district doing? He was sucking his thumb, perhaps, and wondering if he would ever get to Congress. [Laughter.] I have been called by telegram into a hundred Democratic campaigns.

Mr. Burleson, knowing my devotion to Jeffersonian Democracy, sent for me in the last campaign—wired to national headquarters that I was one of the best campaigners in the United States representing the Democracy of Jefferson, Wilson, and Bryan. [Applause and laughter.] I had nothing to do with it, except to thank him and accept their request and campaign a large part of the West. I have been called often by telegram in every national campaign for 25 years, and if I had devoted my time in staying at home to practice law like he did I could have had plenty of money, plenty of it; but I gave my time to the public. I wore the backs off of nine volumes of Thomas Jefferson, traveling largely at my own expense, and had them rebound. [Laughter.]

I am very much obliged, my friends. I just wanted to give you a little history that perhaps you were not acquainted with. I thank you. I want the resolution to cover a thorough investigation, as pledged by President Wilson when we passed the eight-hour law. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS and Mr. SHERLEY rose.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] a member of this committee?

Mr. SIMS. Not a member of the Rules Committee, but a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] rise?

Mr. SHERLEY. I rise to state my opposition to the amendment that has been offered.

Mr. SIMS. I want to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, because I think it will have the effect to defeat any legislation at all.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. How much time was used by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS] in favor of the resolution?

Mr. SIMS. If the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] wants to address himself to that subject, I will gladly yield to him, if I have anything to yield.

Mr. WINGO. A parliamentary inquiry. There was 1 hour's time, 30 minutes to be used by those in favor of the resolution and 30 minutes by those who oppose it. Each of the gentlemen who have spoken are in favor of the resolution, although they have not confined their remarks to it. Now, who is going to determine the control of the time of those opposed to the resolution?

Mr. ADAMSON. I can not understand to save my life that the gentleman from Texas favored this resolution, because he tried to take all the meat out by the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair, as far as his opinion as to whom this time ought to be charged up to is concerned, will state that the first gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] was against the resolution and the second gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS] in favor of the resolution.

Mr. ADAMSON. I recognized that, I thought.

The SPEAKER. Under this rule nobody controls the time, and the duty of the Chair is, when a gentleman rises, to ask him which side of this resolution he is on. It leaves 25 minutes to a side. Now, on which side is the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am in favor of the resolution and opposed to the amendment that has been offered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized in favor of the resolution.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I need not say to those who have known me here for some years that I am not now an advocate of Government ownership of railroads. But the amendment that was offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] serves to go very much further than to eliminate that particular subject from the inquiry. I am not one of those who expect great results from inquiries of this kind, but inasmuch as we are to have the inquiry I think it would be very unwise to adopt the amendment that was offered. The amendment would eliminate from consideration not only the question of Government ownership of railroads but the question of Government ownership of telegraph, telephone, and wireless communication.

Now, especially in regard to the latter, there may be peculiar reasons outside of economic ones why the Government should take control of wireless communication.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield for a minute?

Mr. SHERLEY. In a moment. There are reasons which would apply to telegraph and telephone communication that would not apply to railroads. These subjects are all distinct, and I do not believe that the House commits itself to the adoption of any policy simply when it authorizes an inquiry touching a given matter.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BLACK. I will just say to the gentleman from Kentucky that I will offer an amendment to the amendment to eliminate the limitation that they have put on wireless apparatus, because I can see good reasons why the Government in a military sense and for military purposes should control this wireless apparatus. The point I meant to speak to was the public-utility feature.

Mr. SHERLEY. To that extent the gentleman has improved his amendment. I am not prepared now to say that we ought to exclude any inquiry as to telephone and telegraph.

Mr. BLACK. Does the gentleman think this committee has any jurisdiction over wireless?

Mr. SHERLEY. I am not prepared to say it has, but I am not particularly concerned when the committee is engaged in an inquiry as broad as this and when its power is simply to report as to whether one of the subject matters comes within the ordinary jurisdiction of that committee.

I simply wanted to suggest to the House that if you are going to have the inquiry there is no value in eliminating all of these subject matters. They will not be exhausted by the inquiry made by this committee, and doubtless some of them will not even be touched before the time arrives for them to make a report. But for us to just offhand curtail any inquiry of that kind that the committee might develop in the hearing in some way, and which might be valuable as throwing light on the main subject, would be to my mind unwise, and I do not desire that that phase of the question should be overlooked. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to amend the amendment by striking out the word "wireless."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas moves to amend his amendment by striking out the word "wireless"?

Mr. BLACK. Yes; I ask unanimous consent to do that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves to modify his amendment by striking out the word "wireless." Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have only a word to say.

The SPEAKER. Which side does the gentleman speak for?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I am against the amendment. I am in favor of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I agree cordially with what the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] has just said. I do not know that I can add anything to that statement further than to say that this investigation is simply, as I understand, to make an inquiry with a view to presenting the testimony of witnesses and possibly the conclusions of the committee upon facts that are of very great importance to the people of the United States to consider.

As the gentleman from Kentucky said, by the adoption of this resolution we do not commit ourselves to the adoption of anything that the committee may recommend, or to the adoption of Government ownership or anything else; but facts and a knowledge of facts can not injure any man whose mind has any strength at all. This is nothing but to acquaint us with facts and add to the sum, possibly, of knowledge in the House of Representatives, although that seems a somewhat difficult task; but I think it can be accomplished [laughter] if we tell this committee to go on, as the gentleman from Kentucky said, and investigate this important subject and report the facts which they find.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Black amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks for a division. Those in favor of a division will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Forty-eight gentlemen have arisen in the affirmative. Those opposed will rise and stand until they are counted. [After counting.] Ninety-nine gentlemen have arisen in the negative. On this question the yeas are 48 and the noes are 99.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas withdraws the point of no quorum. On this vote the yeas are 48 and the noes are 99, and the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. ADAMSON rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. ADAMSON. Under the rule the previous question was ordered, and the resolution and the amendments are to be voted on.

The SPEAKER. The rule provides for an hour's debate.

Mr. ADAMSON. For not exceeding an hour's debate.

The SPEAKER. Yes; for not exceeding an hour's debate.

Mr. ADAMSON. If there is no other amendment, we are ready for a vote.

The SPEAKER. Maybe somebody wants to discuss the question. If nobody wants to speak, the Chair will put the question on agreeing to the joint resolution.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, is the time all exhausted? If not, I would like to be recognized as against the resolution for a few minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman. There is no trouble about that. The trouble is the bother with the rule.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this subject has been investigated all the way from here to the Union Station. [Laughter.] It does not make any difference how much investigating you do; you can not get any more knowledge on it than is available for everybody already.

What I wanted to say chiefly, however, was to correct what seemed to be a general misapprehension of the economics of railroad rates. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS] expressed it. The general supposition seems to be that the capitalization of the railroads has something to do with the rates charged for transportation. The idea is that if the railroad is capitalized high its rates must be high, that the high capitalization is charged up to the public. There is not a scintilla of evidence showing that that is true.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. PLATT. No; I can not yield at present.

Mr. GORDON. I can show you that you are mistaken.

Mr. PLATT. I know of two railroads in the State of New York which illustrate the situation. One has a high capitalization, and the other a low one, but their rates are the same practically. The road with the higher capitalization could not charge more if it wanted to, without losing its business. It is a matter of economics. Before the Interstate Commerce Commission and other regulating bodies interfered, the railroads used to charge what they could get, or, as railroad men say, "What the traffic would bear," and the railroad having a high capitalization could not get any more than the railroad having a low capitalization. Now, the Interstate Commerce Commission regulates the matter, but within lines fixed by economic law.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes; I yield to the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. ADAMSON. I do not deny the gentleman's statement that we all know about this already. The trouble is that we know it in different ways. Some of us know it one way and others know it another way. What we want to do is to clarify the situation and make it plain to all.

Mr. PLATT. I do not believe that the committee can clarify a situation which has been cleared up by the president of Yale University and many others who have written books about it.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. LEWIS. The point that has just been made was as to the effect of overcapitalization, that it would not affect railroad rates. That is the opinion of very many railway economists.

Mr. PLATT. Yes; and they are right.

Mr. LEWIS. Now another question.

Mr. PLATT. Very well.

Mr. LEWIS. First in the case of a railroad that is already overcapitalized by one hundred millions. There are such cases.

Mr. PLATT. Possibly.

Mr. LEWIS. Upon which \$100,000,000 dividends are paid to the extent of \$5,000,000 a year. Is it not a fact that in such case the \$5,000,000 that goes to pay dividends, instead of making a reserve and surplus, determines the ability of that railroad to finance new projects and finance betterments and earnings devoted to paying dividends on watered stock directly curtail the railway in its necessary financing? Now, answer that question.

Mr. PLATT. If the gentleman has finished, I will say that I believe that is true to a certain extent. That is, overcapitalization does do something to cripple the finances of a railroad, and it ought to be stopped, and I believe in some such measure as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN] has advocated, a plan to regulate the issue of stocks and bonds. We do that in the State of New York through our public-service commission, and we do it there very effectively; but when I say that I do not say that the capitalization of a railroad has any effect on the rates which it may charge. It has no effect. There is no evidence whatever that that makes any difference. Take the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad Co., which was so woefully mismanaged, to say the least, where millions of money were spent foolishly—

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Looted.

Mr. PLATT. Looted, if you please to say so. I will not greatly object to the use of that term. But the New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroad has not raised its rates since then, and can not. It could not raise them, even if the Interstate Commerce Commission were abolished, to any considerable extent. Rates have nothing to do with capitalization and have never had anything to do with it.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. PLATT. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Of course, the capitalization of a railroad has this effect: That railroad companies which are overcapitalized seek to fix their charges upon their capitalization. But the courts have held in every case, both the Supreme Court of the United States and the courts of the States, that they would not allow an overcapitalization to influence the determination of the question as to whether a rate was confiscatory, but that has to be determined upon the value of the property, regardless of what the artificial capitalization is. If in any case the question should come up whether a rate fixed was confiscatory, it would not be determined upon the capitalization, but it would be determined upon the value of the property. In that sense the gentleman is entirely right.

Mr. PLATT. I agree with the gentleman on that, though he is talking about law and I am talking about economics. Of course, when the rates of a railroad are attacked and when the Interstate Commerce Commission or any other body seeks to lower those rates the railroad sets up the claim that if its rates are lowered it will not be able to pay its fixed charges, interest, dividends, and so forth. It is natural that a railroad should set up that claim, but that does not prove by any means that capitalization has anything to do with rates. The rates as they were formerly fixed, and as they are fixed to-day, are substantially according to the value of the service, or what the traffic will bear, as railroad men say, and the capitalization has nothing to do with it. Many cases might be cited to show that capitalization has nothing whatever to do with rates.

Mr. DOWELL. When rates are fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission, is not capitalization taken into consideration in fixing or in raising those rates?

Mr. PLATT. I do not think it is taken into consideration at all, except as a matter of law. The railroads, of course, set up the claim that their charges must be considered.

Mr. DOWELL. Is not that set up each time as a reason why the rates should be raised, because it is said the railroads are not receiving sufficient revenue to pay dividends on the capitalization?

Mr. PLATT. They will set it up as a claim, but that is not the economic reason for the fixing of rates and never has been and never will be.

Mr. DOWELL. Is not that one of the reasons that they urge—that they are not receiving a sufficient return on the investment?

Mr. PLATT. Of course, that is one reason that they urge. They have their capitalization, their stock and bonds already issued and in the hands of the public, and they are more or less bound to protect their investors; but that does not make the rates.

Mr. DOWELL. Would there be any harm in making an investigation to determine whether the railroads are overcapitalized?

Mr. PLATT. Those facts are already secured and published in a thousand volumes that you can get in the Congressional Library to-day, and if the committee spent a hundred thousand years in taking testimony they could not add anything to what has already been published on that subject. [Applause.]

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Which side is the gentleman on?

Mr. MURRAY. I am for the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY. How much time is left, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. Fifteen minutes on the affirmative side.

[Mr. MURRAY addressed the House. See Appendix.]

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. To ask for recognition. I wish to reply to the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] on his proposition.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman for the resolution?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] will agree that he was mistaken as to whether the amount of stock and bonds can be taken into consideration in fixing the rate. That question has been definitely decided for the people of the United States in the unanimous opinion of the Supreme Court, volume 169, Smyth against Ames, in an opinion rendered by Justice Harlan. I call the gentleman's attention to what the court said on page 546:

We hold, however, that the basis of all calculations as to the reasonableness of rates to be charged by a corporation maintaining a highway under legislative sanction must be the fair value of the property being used by it for the convenience of the public. And in order to ascertain that value the original cost of construction, the amount expended in permanent improvements, the amount and market value of its bonds and stock, the present as compared with the original cost of construction, the probable earning capacity of the property under particular rates prescribed by statute, and the sum required to meet operating expenses are all matters for consideration and are to be given such weight as may be just and right in each case.

Therefore it is a matter which enters into the determination of what is a just rate for the railroad to charge. That is, I mean the matter of the amount of value of its bonds and stocks. One element which affects the reasonableness of the rates to determine whether they are confiscatory—

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. BARNHART. Does the gentleman argue that the rate should be fixed upon the amount of stock and bonds and not on the value of the property?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not contend anything but what the Supreme Court said. The gentleman from Indiana did not understand the purport of the decision. I will read that portion of the opinion again which answers his question.

Mr. BARNHART. I understood the gentleman to say that it was value of the stock and bonds and not the value of the property.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Oh, no; the court says:

We hold, however, that the basis of all calculations as to the reasonableness of rates to be charged by a corporation maintaining a highway under legislative sanction must be the fair value of the property being used by it for the convenience of the public. And in order to ascertain that value, the original cost of construction, the amount expended in permanent improvements, the amount and market value of its bonds and stock, the present as compared with the original cost of construction, the probable earning capacity of the property under particular rates prescribed by statute, and the sum required to meet operating expenses are all matters for consideration, and are to be given such weight as may be just and right in each case.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I voted for this rule, and I am going to vote for the resolution; but I have heard from those about me the suggestions that those who were in favor of the resolution are in favor of Government ownership of railroads. I want to make myself understood on that point. I have taken occasion at another time in this Congress to point out the trend toward paternalism in the administration now in power with such criticism as I could make. I think it is serious. I am not in favor of Government ownership. I have many reasons why I think I should be opposed to it, and I believe that knowledge and information is the surest way to prove that the Government can not afford to go into a project of Government ownership. [Applause.]

I think that when we act without information we are acting with a good deal of prejudice, and when we act with prejudice we never act sanely or safely. I do not believe that we should undertake to suppress public opinion, but I do think that we ought to direct public opinion, and we can not direct it unless we have information. As an opponent of Government ownership of railroads I am going to vote for the plan to secure the information that I think will enable our people to see why we ought not to have Government ownership, but to keep it under private control, with Government regulations.

Mr. BARNHART. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. BARNHART. I want to ask the gentleman when he makes his speech on the trend toward paternalism if he will

not be fair enough to go back two or three previous administrations to get the foundation there.

Mr. FESS. I think my friend from Indiana is justified in saying that there has been a paternalistic trend before this administration, but I never have seen anything equal to the present administration, and I think my friend is going headlong where he does not want the Government to go. It is simply appalling to me. In the last session the amount of money we have spent in governmental functions that ought to be retained in private enterprise is simply appalling to me, and I do not want to be recorded in voting for this resolution as being in favor of Government ownership, for I will fight it when it comes on the floor.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for two minutes, which is all that remains on that side.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I shall vote for this resolution. I favor the most thorough investigation of this subject matter. I propounded the question to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] with reference to the manner in which the rates are now fixed for transportation. This inquiry was fully answered by the gentleman from Wisconsin presenting his authority that in fixing the freight rates the stock and the valuation of the stock is one of the things considered in fixing the rates.

I voted against the amendment presented by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK], because I favor the adoption of the original resolution, and a full investigation of the entire subject matter. I think this investigation should be made for the purpose of presenting all of these facts before Congress in order that we may know what legislation is necessary.

Mr. PLATT rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. PLATT. I rise to oppose the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has made one speech, and the rule is that he can make but one.

Mr. PLATT. But the gentleman from Wisconsin has made two.

The SPEAKER. That was an oversight on the part of the Speaker. [Laughter.]

[Mr. WINGO addressed the House. See Appendix.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

The question was taken and the Speaker announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. WINGO. A division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa demands the yeas and nays. [After counting.] Twenty-five gentlemen have arisen; not a sufficient number and the resolution is passed.

Mr. WINGO. No; Mr. Speaker, the House was in the act of dividing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. WINGO. The House was in the act of dividing when the demand was made. We are entitled to a division, because that was never had.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 146, noes 61.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point of no quorum and the Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and fifty-eight Members are present; a quorum.

So the joint resolution was passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19410) making appropriation for the services of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that the general debate on this bill be limited to six hours, three hours of that time to be controlled by the chairman and three hours by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON], the ranking minority member of the committee.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. TAGUE. For a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know whether or not all the time of the minority is to be controlled by one member who has filed one minority report as against five other members who have also filed a minority report and whether or not we are entitled to a portion of that time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will answer the gentleman from Massachusetts that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] asks unanimous consent that the time for general debate be limited to not more than six hours, and that he control one half and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] the other half. He is asking unanimous consent.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] whether or not we can arrange for a division of the time, the other minority members having a part of the time.

Mr. STEENERSON. I think I will be fair in allotting time to those who are entitled to it, but I do not want to make an agreement to waive the portion of the time that the chairman proposes on my side of the question. I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] is opposed to certain features of the bill, and I will be disposed to yield him time in case I can without curtailing others.

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] say to that?

Mr. TAGUE. I think, Mr. Speaker, we ought to have some agreement as to time. I think the members of the committee who have filed a minority report, five of them, are entitled to at least a fair portion of the time. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are very many Members in this House, living in cities affected by some of the legislation now on this bill, who have asked for time, and I think, Mr. Speaker, we should be entitled to at least half of the time controlled by the minority. And I will ask, Mr. Speaker, that we be allowed one hour and a half of the three hours to be controlled by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON].

Mr. MANN. That is not a fair request.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Speaker, the item to which the gentleman is opposed is only a small part of the bill. It is only one item out of several hundred. The only point in which the gentleman from Massachusetts is interested is one item of appropriation amounting to \$400,000 and some odd, which he wants to raise to \$800,000, and there are \$300,000,000 carried in the bill. Therefore I do not think that that item to which he is opposed ought to take half of the time of the whole bill. I can not agree to that. I have told the gentleman that if I have time to spare that is not spoken for by members of the committee, or those entitled to speak, I will grant it. The gentleman knows I am opposed to the provision. I have made a minority report against the provision of which the gentleman speaks, and he made an additional minority report several days after the minority report was filed. So we are on the same side as to that item. It does not seem to me they ought to control half of the time on this bill because they are interested in one item, on which I am with them.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, the time upon appropriation bills is usually divided by the center aisle, the Democratic side having half of the time and the Republican side half of the time. I should suppose that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] might be able to get some time from this side of the House, but he ought to get most of his time, I should think, from his own side of the House.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I make this suggestion, reserving the right to object, that if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON] yields to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] 45 minutes and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] likewise yields to him 45 minutes, it would make him an hour and a half—

Mr. MANN. Why should we give the same amount of time from this side to the gentleman from Massachusetts? He is not the only pebble on the beach.

Mr. COX. I quite agree with the gentleman from Illinois that that is true; but, as I understand, the minority on this Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads is with the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MANN. Then they ought not to try to hold us up. I will never consent in the House by unanimous consent to the Democratic side deliberately holding up the Republican side of the House in reference to debate, inasmuch as we never attempt to do that to the Democratic side.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, there is no disposition on my part at all to control any of the time. It is utterly immaterial to me. I am entirely willing for the Speaker to control it. I do not care anything about this debate one way or the other. I do not

think there is anything in the contention of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE], but if it will do him any good at all, I will give to him and his side one hour that comes to me and any other Republican one-half an hour.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. MOON. I said of the time to be allotted to the majority on the bill I am willing to give one hour of it to the Democrats and Republicans that oppose the bill. I know there is nothing in the position these gentlemen have taken, I do not care how much they debate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not hear the last part of it.

Mr. MOON. I would give the majority of the House two hours and give the other four hours to the other gentlemen.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will restate the request of the gentleman from Tennessee. His request is that general debate be limited to not exceed six hours; that he control one-half, and will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] and others opposed to the bill one hour of that time, and the gentleman from Minnesota is to control three hours. Is that stated right?

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire, as the gentleman on the other side says, to hold up the business of the House, but I contend I have no right, Mr. Speaker, to go to the majority party or the majority of the committee and ask for time on a bill that I am opposing. My time must come out of the side at least—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is mistaken about the practice of the House. For 20 years it has been the practice of the House on appropriation bills, as a rule, to divide the time equally between the two political sides of the House, and invariably over here gentlemen who have charge of the bill have recognized those both for and against the proposition, yielding them time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Minnesota if he is willing to yield one-half hour of his time to the minority Members who have reported against this bill with me?

The SPEAKER. What does the gentleman from Minnesota say?

Mr. STEENERSON. I do not want to make any agreement in advance, but I will bear it in mind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SABATH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I think the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts is fair. I understand that about four or five members of the committee have joined in a minority report with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] opposed to certain provisions in the bill. And, consequently, they would be entitled to the time from the gentleman on the other side.

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman is entirely mistaken. I will say, with his permission, that the minority report on that item was made by myself, and I am in entire harmony with these dissenting Democrats, but I do not want to have them think that because I am their friend they can curtail my privileges in the control of the time allotted to the minority.

Mr. SABATH. Why don't you show your friendship by yielding to them such amount of time as they need?

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman from Illinois was not on the floor and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TAGUE] seems to doubt that I would be fair with them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 19410) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, with Mr. CRISP in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 19410) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and they are hereby, appropriated for the service of the Post Office Department, in conformity with the act of July 2, 1836, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.

For gas, electric power and light, and the repair of machinery, United States Post Office Department equipment shops building, \$4,500.

For salaries of post-office inspectors: For salaries of 15 inspectors in charge of divisions, at \$3,000 each; 30 inspectors, at \$2,400 each; 20 inspectors, at \$2,250 each; 32 inspectors, at \$2,100 each (an increase of 2 submitted in lieu of 2 assistant superintendents, Railway Mail Service, at \$2,350 each; to be transferred from the office of the Second Assistant); 20 inspectors, at \$2,000 each; 30 inspectors, at \$1,900 each; 90 inspectors, at \$1,800 each; 60 inspectors, at \$1,700 each; 60 inspectors, at \$1,600 each; and 65 inspectors, at \$1,500 each; in all, \$783,700.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman of the committee asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee has not asked for recognition.

Mr. MOON. No; I did not ask for recognition.

Mr. TAGUE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Chairman how much time I have?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one hour under the rules of the House.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CONRY] 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman the disposition of that hour?

The CHAIRMAN. He has. Under the general rules of the House, when a Member is recognized, he is entitled to one hour, and under the rules of the House under general debate he has the right to use it or yield it as he sees fit.

Mr. MOON. All right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CONRY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CONRY. Mr. Chairman, the report issued by the Postmaster General, under date of December 9, 1916, sets forth that the pneumatic-tube service in New York City is to be curtailed by the discontinuance of that service between the general post office in Brooklyn and the postal station located at the railroad terminal of the Long Island division of the Pennsylvania Railroad at Atlantic Avenue and Fourth Avenue, a distance of 1.35 miles. That report also contains a recommendation that the pneumatic-tube service from all stations in Manhattan located south of Forty-fifth Street and Lexington Avenue, on the east side of the town, and at Thirty-ninth Street near Eighth Avenue, on the west side of the town, shall be accorded this service, while stations both east and west to the north of these points will be accorded this service only on condition that the contractor is willing to operate this section of the system at a greatly reduced rental to the Government.

This report also states that no contracts will be entered into by the Postmaster General unless they contain a clause giving him the right to discontinue any and all service upon six months' notice. He undoubtedly expected that his recommendations would excite powerful protests from the business interests of Greater New York when he expressed the view that an insidious lobby might become active, enlisting as "its spokesmen well-meaning but ill-informed citizens, who, believing that they are acting in the interests of better postal service, will bring directly or indirectly every influence possible to perpetuate this incubus."

As a Representative from the city of New York, it seems very strange to me that the Postmaster General should attempt by a remark of this kind to stifle the expression of public opinion whether in indorsement of his views or in refutation of the contention which he embodies in his recommendation.

Citizens of New York City, business men of the largest and most progressive city in the world, have emphatically expressed their resentment of these recommendations in a manner which is both forceful and effective. Their activity proves conclusively that they are not misinformed upon this subject; that they know what they want, and how they shall go about the accomplishment of their purpose; that they are fully alive to, and have an intelligent conception of, the importance of the postal

service in New York, and this is evidenced by the fact that upon two days' notice representative business men from nearly every commercial organization in the city appeared before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads in protest against the proposed curtailment of the postal facilities of their city. And since the day of that hearing, December 14 last, these business men, awake to the dangers confronting them, have through the medium of their business organizations analyzed the postal conditions of the city and found good reason for indorsing their postmaster in his urgent recommendation that there be no discontinuance of the pneumatic-tube service at any point, but, on the contrary, that the service should be extended to include other sections of the rapidly growing and industrial community.

These business men realize that the congested condition in the traffic of New York City renders surface transportation almost impossible at the present time, even though \$400,000,000 have been expended by the city of New York in the construction of subways for the transportation of the people in all the boroughs except that of Richmond, located in the lower harbor of New York.

And I would like to state, in this connection, that of the business men who have taken an interest in this proposition over 95 per cent are automobile owners and operators, and they have learned by their experience in the working of these machines the great difficulties which the congested streets of New York, from the Battery to One hundred and sixty-third Street, force upon any surface method of transportation; and as a result of this experience, and with a knowledge of the transportation facilities that obtain in our city, both above and beneath the ground, these men realize that the pneumatic-tube service must not be curtailed. They realize further that there is no comparison between the working of the pneumatic tube in the transportation of the mails and the proposed system of transportation of first-class mail matter on the surface of the street by vehicular agencies. They understand, as a result of an experience of almost 20 years, that because of the presence of the pneumatic-tube service within the postal districts of New York and Brooklyn that their mails from the country merchants and the country banker are expedited from the terminals to their respective offices. And when we take into consideration that 383 trains containing mail matter arrive at the numerous railway terminals serving the city of New York daily we can readily understand the great difficulties and the manifold delays which will tend to encumber and to interfere with the dispatch of the ordinary business of the city in case the pneumatic service is curtailed. It is not surprising, then, that they should protest against the proposed policy of curtailment recommended by the postal authorities, and their protest is as much in the interests of the country merchant and the country banker, with whom they are in constant communication through the agencies of the Postal Service, as in the interests of the city merchant and the city banker. Their protest is supported by official authority, by the contention of no less distinguished authority than Hon. Charles Emory Smith, who, as Postmaster General of the United States in discussing the merits of the pneumatic-tube service in 1901, said:

In the great cities pneumatic-tube service is too important and vital an agency of postal expedition to be abandoned. It is an instrumentality which, within reasonable limitations, has come to stay as a part of the modern system of communication. It can no more be discarded than the fast mail trains. To strain every nerve to save a half hour or one hour on the railroad and then to waste a half hour which might easily be saved at the point of departure or destination would be incongruous and unwise. The fast mail train is employed only where the conditions justify it. I say that the pneumatic-tube service is to be used only where in sound reason the importance and value of the return warrant it.

And the business men of New York, in their wise judgment and experience, believe that any improved method for the handling of mail matter is justifiable, is warrantable, and in the end pays for itself by increasing the earnings of the Post Office Department. These business men in dealing with increased demands of business necessitating rapid intercommunication know that in the mail issued from their respective places of business for delivery within the city pneumatic mail-tube service affords them a speedy and thoroughly efficient means of transportation, which insures replies to their communications within three or, at the outside, four hours of their initial mailing.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONRY. I do.

Mr. MOON. Does the gentleman know what proportion of the whole mail is carried through the pneumatic-tube service?

Mr. CONRY. I could not say what proportion.

Mr. MOON. Does the gentleman know what class is carried?

Mr. CONRY. First class.

Mr. MOON. Yes. What proportion of the first class goes through the tubes?

Mr. CONRY. I can not say the exact proportion.

Mr. MOON. Is it not a fact that it is about 12 per cent?

Mr. CONRY. I could not say the exact amount. I am perfectly candid with the gentleman. I am simply discussing the salient features of this proposition. If I had more time I would go into it more fully.

Mr. MOON. Does the gentleman know how much it costs per mile to carry the mail?

Mr. CONRY. No; but I do know that the Post Office Department, through the transportation of the first-class mail, says there is an earning of many million a year, an earning of \$20,000 a day, and that income produced by the transportation of first-class mail is, in the estimation of business men, sufficient to justify the perpetuation of this system.

Mr. MOON. Well, the gentleman is not informed on the question I asked him about: Is it \$17,000 a mile?

Mr. CONRY. Yes.

Mr. MOON. Now, in New York the mail can be carried a little quicker through the pneumatic tubes than it can be carried by automobile, owing to the congested state of the streets, can it not?

Mr. CONRY. A little quicker, yes; a great deal.

Mr. MOON. Therefore the committee has not reported against the continuation of the tube in New York.

Mr. CONRY. But the Postmaster General has recommended in his report a curtailment of an integral part of that service.

Mr. MOON. Yes.

Mr. CONRY. The abolition of which would interfere with the efficacy of the entire service. And if the gentleman will permit me to proceed, I will discuss the financial phases of the situation.

Mr. MOON. There is nothing in the bill to do that. I will ask the gentleman this much: Is there any other appropriation in the bill that would be applicable to New York City?

Mr. CONRY. There is a specific impairment recommended by the Postmaster General, against which I am protesting in my speech, and against which the business community in New York City is very forcibly protesting. According to the records of the Post Office Department about 1,000,000 first-class letters are mailed within the postal district of New York for delivery within that district daily. This enormous dispatch of first-class mail produces a revenue of \$20,000 per day, and from that revenue it is only fair and reasonable that an expeditious service should be maintained to serve and advance the business of such a progressive community. Commenting upon the cost of this service, the Postmaster General of the United States, in a communication addressed to the Speaker of this House, dated February 4, 1901, said:

While the cost is great—

The rate in New York City at that time was \$48,000 per mile per annum for the service then in operation—

the demonstrable advantage is proportionately greater. Besides, there are good reasons for believing that its maintenance and moderate extension in the large cities will stimulate an increased business and will pay for its cost.

Business men who control the manufacturing establishments of the country and who have adopted every modern device for the promotion of increased efficiency, and looking to the increased output of production would not, in my opinion, deem it wise or profitable to return to the service or method of production based upon principles of industry that obtained 20 years ago. Such would not be good business policy and would not be consistent with good business judgment. Neither would it pay nor lead to the development of improved marketable conditions. It therefore does not seem good business judgment in the view of the business men of New York City to discontinue the pneumatic-tube service, which is rendered so necessary by existing business conditions, and to return to the surface method for the transportation of mail matter.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONRY. Yes; I will.

Mr. GALLAGHER. What do you say as to the statement of the postmaster at Chicago, who says that these pneumatic tubes are "no good"?

Mr. CONRY. Well, I would not like to characterize a statement of that character coming from a gentleman occupying such a distinguished position.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That was the statement made before the committee.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONRY. Yes.

Mr. DYER. I would like to say that the postmaster at St. Louis, where we have these pneumatic tubes, has written a

letter in which he says that they are very valuable and that there will be nothing found that can take their place and give the service that we now have.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CONRY. Yes.

Mr. HULBERT. Did not the postmaster at New York, who has been in the service of the United States Post Office Department for about 45 years, unqualifiedly indorse the pneumatic-tube service in New York and emphasize its necessity?

Mr. CONRY. Yes. It would be like discontinuing the fast trains and return to the method of transportation in vogue when the prairie was an undiscovered field and the oxen and prairie schooner were the commodious, though inconvenient, method of passing from one outpost of civilization to another. The pneumatic-tube service in its entirety in New York City is just as essential to the success of the business men of New York City and the Post Office Department of the United States as are the fast-moving trains connecting the Metropolis with the seaports on the Pacific coast.

The Postmaster General says that this service is expensive. Is it? Has he stopped to analyze its cost? Has he considered for a moment the method by which he is comparing the pneumatic-tube service with the automobile service. He says that it is purely a matter of expense, whereas the business people of New York say that it is a matter of service, not expense. To assume that his premise is correct, what does this pneumatic-tube service cost? Let us see. When the service was first installed in the city of New York, connecting the Produce Exchange with the general post office, and the general post office with stations D, Madison Square, F, and H (now called the Grand Central Terminal), 4.2 miles, the Post Office Department paid the contractors \$158,000 per annum, or at the rate of \$38,000 per mile per annum. The service then was worth every penny paid for it. The streets of New York, even then as now, were very congested, and the sections of the city served by the pneumatic tube were densely populated and so heavily encumbered with factories and other productive enterprises that the revenue of the Post Office Department from that district alone was increased within the period of four years approximately 40 per cent.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONRY. Yes.

Mr. MOON. What time was the gentleman speaking of?

Mr. CONRY. The time of the establishment of the system—in 1897.

Mr. MOON. That was the one that was abolished afterwards?

Mr. CONRY. Yes.

Mr. MOON. You recollect the history of the fraud that abolished that?

Mr. CONRY. No; I have no recollection of it, but I do recollect the history of the frauds connected with the operation of the automobile system, and the condition of transportation that occurred in the city of New York three years ago, in consequence of which certain gentlemen connected with those frauds were imprisoned, and certain people connected with the frauds were fined, I believe, \$50,000.

Mr. MOON. That was a very proper thing to do. May I ask the gentleman if he recollects that other transaction?

Mr. CONRY. No; I do not recollect that.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONRY. Yes.

Mr. HULBERT. Has the gentleman information of what fines were imposed on the pneumatic-tube people by reason of the thefts that were committed in that service?

Mr. CONRY. No; I have not. I am not discussing that situation. I am simply discussing the economic efficiency of this instrumentality for the transmission of the mails.

On April 21, 1902, Congress enacted a law covering the issuance of contracts for service of this character and provided that—

No contract shall be made in any city providing for 3 miles or more of double line of tubes which shall involve an expenditure in cost of \$17,000 per mile per annum, and said compensation shall cover power, labor, and all operating expenses.

This price was not imposed upon the Government by the contractor, but upon the contractor by the Government, and under the terms of the act of 1902 the contractor has increased the service by direction of the Postmaster General from 4.2 to approximately 27 miles in New York City, and now he is told that the system constructed by direction of the Post Office Department must be cut in two, and that he must take less money for one half than he can secure from the Post Office Department for the other half.

This is a stern condition. Taking the most charitable view of such a burden imposed by the Government, to say the least, it lacks the elements of equity and possesses for the contractor a stern necessity which he is compelled to assume or deliberately abandon his business. The existing rate of pay under the contract is \$17,000 per mile per annum, \$45.48 per mile per day, or \$2.32 per mile per hour; and, as it is possible to transmit or dispatch a carrier on 10 seconds' headway in both directions, because the line is of double construction in New York City, the Post Office Department may secure 720 carrier dispatches per hour, and the rate per carrier dispatch is about three-tenths of a cent per hour. That does not seem extravagantly expensive in comparison with the cost of automobile service. Its availability, its continuity of service, the fact that it is accessible for use every moment of every period of the day, takes it out of the realm of comparison with the surface transportation scheme and proves conclusively that the automobile is scarcely its competitor. Under the present contract for mail transportation by means of motor vehicles in the city of New York the Post Office Department is paying approximately 60 cents per mile. Now, the automobile operating on a schedule of 30 minutes' headway is only available twice in an hour. Two automobiles are there required, we will say, for a mile circuit. That means four automobiles per hour, or \$2.40 per hour for a vehicular service only available four times every 60 minutes, when the conditions of street congestion do not interrupt its adherence to schedule.

And the Post Office Department contends that automobile service will meet the requirements of the New York postal district in the rapid handling of mail; would have us to believe and to be credulous enough to consider that they can do with automobiles what we know it has been able to do through the instrumentality of the present pneumatic-tube service.

The Postmaster General in his report states that the interruptions to pneumatic-tube service are frequent. He, however, has not told us in his report, nor does it appear in the report of the departmental commission appointed by him, how much money has been exacted as fines from the contractor for the pneumatic-tube service during the past two years. I have been informed by reliable authority that in the two or three years last past, the pneumatic-tube contractor has been fined approximately \$100 for failure in service, and these failures cover a wide range, viz, delays, interruptions, soiling of mail matter, and delinquencies on the part of the employees of the contractor. The department, which bears the burden and which under the law has the right to exact fines from any earnings accruing to the contractor, has only imposed fines upon him in the sum of approximately \$50 per year. Under the terms of the contract the contractor earns about \$500,000 per year, and is fined only \$50 out of that possible earning capacity. Under this showing there can not be any substantial weight given to the contention that this service has inflicted injury upon the Government by reason of interruptions of service, but, on the contrary, it was stated by the postmaster at New York, who appeared before the committee, that "the number of train connections missed and consequent delay to the mails during December, 1915, January, February, and March, 1916, due to irregularities in mail-wagon—auto—service occasioned by snowstorms and resultant congested and slippery streets was 209," or an average of more than 50 trains missed per month, notwithstanding the fact that the mails closed 30 minutes earlier in order to allow that additional leeway.

During the nearly two decades of the existence of the tube service in New York City the postal business of the city has increased from \$8,154,000 to \$33,518,250. This growth and development has been largely due to the improvement of the system which it is now proposed to curtail. The postal business of New York City to-day nets a surplus revenue of \$20,000,000 to the Post Office Department, which should justify a policy, based upon sound business principles of extension rather than curtailment of such an efficient system.

Business expediency alone, if no other consideration were involved, should dictate the advisability of continuing pneumatic mail tube contracts as they apply to Greater New York, on a scope of service no less restricted than is found in existing facilities, and on such terms as may insure to this highly concentrated postal district the best available instrumentalities for the reduction of congestion, maintaining speed of transmission, and continuing the capacity of the New York post office to render satisfactory service to the business interests of the community.

The congestion of New York to-day has reached the utmost limit of the capacity of its thoroughfares for business transportation. Vehicular traffic in motor cars alone has increased from 102,000 in the year of 1915 to 140,000 in the year of 1916,

an increase of 38,000 in one year. This enormous increase has exacted an appalling toll of one human life every 14 hours, and the maiming and injury of one unfortunate every 23 minutes of the 24 hours of every day in the year. This condition is startling in its significance.

We have to-day the most efficient traffic squad and the most perfect traffic regulations of any city in the world, and yet in spite of improved methods of traffic regulation, as population and business increases, the streets of New York are becoming more and more steadily congested. In view of the difficulty in enforcing traffic regulation as to motor trucks carrying United States mails, which has been testified to by the chief of the traffic squad at the hearing before the committee, it would be most unfortunate if a considerable number of mail trucks not now required for the postal service of New York, because of existing tubes, were added to the large number that already encumber our streets. Every consideration of business expediency, every wise precaution for human safety, every element of wisdom involved in the establishment of a sound business policy, demands that the present pneumatic-tube system of the city of Greater New York be continued and perpetuated in its present condition of proved efficiency. [Applause.]

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, the full Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads held open sessions on December 11, 12, 13, and 14, at which a full opportunity was offered to all who desired to be heard in reference to the pneumatic-tube mail service. At those hearings a number of gentlemen representing various business organizations in the several cities where the pneumatic tubes are now in use appeared and made statements, as did officers of the tube companies, and the First Assistant Postmaster General, who was a member of the commission upon whose report the recommendation of the Postmaster General was based.

The two questions upon which the committee desired and sought information were:

First. Do the tubes materially expedite the delivery of the mails? and

Second. Does the better service of the tubes justify its larger cost?

That the tubes do expedite the mail we do not consider any longer an open question. In the beginning many intelligent men doubted the feasibility of those tubes, and to determine that question the act of June 2, 1900, directed the appointment of a commission. In a report to Congress made under date of January 4, 1901, the Postmaster General said:

The reports of these several local and general committees are herewith submitted to Congress, and they are commended to consideration as embracing a large volume of valuable information for the guidance of the legislative branch of the Government in acting on this subject. Attention is specially directed to the report of the second and final general committee, which was selected with great care with a view of securing an efficient representation of the best business, mechanical, and professional knowledge and experience. The chairman, Mr. Theodore C. Search, has for many years been president of the National Association of Manufacturers of the United States. Prof. Robert H. Thurston is director of Sibley College, Cornell University, first assistant engineer, United States Navy, and formerly professor of mechanical engineering of Stevens Institute of Technology. Mr. S. Cristy Mead is assistant secretary of the Merchants' Association of New York, and especially recommended by that body. Mr. Alfred Brooks Fry is chief engineer and superintendent of repairs of United States public buildings, and Messrs. William T. Manning, Frederick A. Halsey, and Lyman E. Cooley are widely known as eminent consulting and mechanical engineers.

The report of this committee presents an intelligent and comprehensive answer to the inquiries embodied in the provision of Congress for the investigation. It reviews the exhibits and conclusions of the joint local committees and the first general committee representing the department, and subjects their recommendations to the best tests of reasonable conditions and requirements which experience and practical wisdom can apply. It considers the feasibility and utility of the pneumatic-tube service as a permanent feature of the Postal System, the conditions which should govern its maintenance and extension, the proper relation of cost to postal receipts, the ratio of expenditure which would be disproportionate to the benefits, the principles which should govern rental from private companies, the advantages of Government ownership and the conditions under which it would be admissible and expedient.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMISSION OF 1900.

(1) This committee finds the pneumatic method of mail transportation a novel, a valuable, and a mechanically successful system, ingeniously elaborated, and practically adapted in an admirable manner to the purposes of the Post Office Department.

(2) The committee finds the system of immense advantage to the business interests of the country in its facilitation of mail transmission, both locally and generally, throughout the United States.

(3) The cost of this advance in postal methods is found to be necessarily large, but yet to be productive of more than proportional advantage in the large cities.

(4) The Government, through its responsible officials, should be the final judge of the extent of ultimate adoption.

(5) The committee advises the retention of all existing plants, and would recommend extensions in a limited number of cases, as specified in the body of this report.

(6) The cost of the pneumatic service is believed to be capable of some reduction, and of very considerable reduction with the further progress of improvement.

(7) It is recommended that the contracts hereafter made should be based upon proposals including exact specifications in detail with all required maps and plans, and capable of precise verification by the expert advisers of the Government.

(8) Ownership by the Government is considered desirable whenever the systems adopted have passed the experimental stage.

(9) A correct system of estimation of a proper rental is advised, and an illustration of such a method is given.

(10) Leasing is admissible under special conditions, described in a general way in the body of this report.

(11) Systems adopted should be as far as practicable standardized, and in operation interchangeability of mail packages therein should be secured.

(12) The system of rental on the basis of a stated percentage of construction cost is condemned.

(13) The Post Office Department should be given precedence in assignment of space in the United States public building where post offices are located, when such space is needed for essential machinery and apparatus and their accessories.

(14) Certain general principles, as specified in this report, should be adopted and adhered to in the decision of questions bearing upon the introduction of such improvements as are here discussed, and in extension and further improvements.

A second commission was appointed in 1905, and its recommendations to the Postmaster General were as follows:

It is not to be expected that a tube in any city can be employed at its full capacity the entire contract time. If the amount of mail to be handled occupied as much as 10 per cent of the capacity of the tube during the dull hours of the day, say, up to 3 p. m., the tube could not, under general conditions, handle all the mail during the "rush" hours of the business day. It is believed that when the amount of first-class mail to be handled would require more than one-half of an hour to transmit at full capacity of tube, being more than 51,000 letters to be transmitted, the transmission of such an amount, together with special-delivery letters, registered mail, and second, third, and fourth class matter, would employ the tube a reasonable per cent of the time. Where there is any such quantity of mail to be transmitted and the frequency of deliveries and collections, the number of trains, and the saving of time in transit by tube, each dispatch indicates advance to such a considerable quantity of mail, the expenditure on account of tube service is thought to be justifiable and advisable. At that rate the cost for each piece transmitted would be less than seven-tenths of a mill a mile.

In the cities of the largest class the pneumatic-tube service can not be considered as an overexpensive service in the light of its capacity to carry a large quantity of mail and the saving of time in transit and general advance in delivery of incoming and outgoing mails. Its advantages are not confined to the people of the cities wherein it is installed in the way of advanced delivery of their mail, but are shared by the people of the whole country in the earlier receipt of mail from the great business centers of the country. A system that advances mail by an earlier train than it could otherwise be dispatched by secures to addressees the benefit of its receipt several hours or, in some cases, days earlier than by other methods. The business of the whole country is interested in and benefited by the speedy, safe, and uninterrupted transportation of mail in the great business centers of the country. Pneumatic-tube service in the largest cities can not be considered a local service, since its benefits are directly or indirectly shared by the whole country.

J. M. MASTEN.
J. H. CREW.
F. W. VAILLE.

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 4, 1905.

A third commission was authorized by the act of May 27, 1908, and its report to the Postmaster General, which was transmitted by him to Congress, under date of December 15, 1908, with his approval, announced the following conclusions:

(1) The pneumatic-tube service is a very important auxiliary for the rapid transportation of first-class mail in the most important cities, and performs a function not at present obtainable by other means.

(2) Its constant availability makes it particularly appropriate for special-delivery mail; for all first-class mail of local origin for local delivery; for supplementary closings of first-class mail for dispatch by train; and for advance dispatches of first-class mail from trains for city delivery.

(3) When established, it should also be employed, as far as possible and economically, for the transportation of other mail.

(4) Registered mail should be sent by tube whenever security and celerity can be combined in practice.

(5) Mechanically the tube service appears to be still in an experimental condition, although considerable progress has been made toward the development of a fixed standard of machinery.

(6) With the above reservation, the regularity and efficiency of the tube service is commendable.

(7) As the present contracts call for the installation of 64½ miles of tube lines and as only 42½ miles are at present in operation, the tube companies should be required to complete their contracts without undue delay, in order that the effect of full and complete systems toward increasing the special-delivery and other first-class mail may be ascertained by the department from actual experience.

(8) The present contracts under which the tube companies are performing mail service will not expire until June 30, 1916—almost eight years hence. During that period there should be ample opportunity for the companies to perfect the systems and for the Post Office Department to observe the effect upon the Postal Service. Further, during that period it is possible that other methods of transportation will be developed or improved so as to change entirely the outlook as it now appears. Five or six years hence, we believe, it will be advisable to renew the consideration of the question of Government ownership.

(9) In view of the foregoing we consider it appropriate to advise you that, in our opinion, it is not feasible and desirable at the present time for the Government to purchase, to install, or to operate the pneumatic tubes, and this is our unanimous judgment.

The committee of 1900 described the pneumatic-tube service as an expensive service, and it appears to be so unless one bears in mind the great frequency of tube-carrier trips, which are made 4 per minute, or 240 per hour (as a minimum). Remembering that the service costs \$17,000 per mile per annum, or \$8,500 one way, the rate per day per mile is about \$25. We must bear in mind, however, that the hours of service are in most cases 20 hours per day thus providing 4,800 carriers' trips through the tube. This represents a cost of only one-half cent per carrier per mile, or one-half cent in transmitting about 450 letters 1 mile. Even on sections of the tube where the service is used for only a small percentage of its capacity, as between stations J and C in Philadelphia, the cost is nevertheless slight. For example, on this section, where only 392 carriers are dispatched both ways daily, with an average of 200 pieces for each carrier, the cost would be 12 cents per carrier mile, or a charge of only about one-half a mill per letter per mile. The constant availability of the tube service for dispatches of mail at any time is a very valuable factor toward maintaining an even circulation of mail and as assisting toward the even employment of the working force. This desirable advantage could hardly be secured by any other method.

The extreme expectations in regard to the capacity of tube service for transmitting first-class mail have not been realized. In this respect the operating companies have also learned by experience that safety of operation requires a greater headway or interval between successive carriers through the tube than was at first thought necessary. In 1897 the interval between carriers was assumed to be 6 seconds, whereas to-day it varies from 13 to 15 seconds. It is said by the American Pneumatic Service Co. that by improved methods a system could be built by which carriers could be dispatched on a headway of from four and one-half to seven seconds, or approximately twice as fast as the present service. To do this, however, would require a different type of terminal apparatus, larger power plants, and considerable more labor. In early calculations the capacity of the tube carrier was rated as 600 letters. It is possible to place 600 letters in one of the tube carriers, but in actual practice this committee has deemed it best to fix the maximum at 450 pieces, thus approving the ratio accepted by the departmental committee of 1905 in making pneumatic-tube investigation. As a result of these several modifications our estimate of the tube capacity one way per hour is now 108,000 pieces instead of 360,000 pieces as was predicted in 1897.

PNEUMATIC TUBE COMMISSION.

(Daniel A. Campbell, postmaster, Chicago, Ill.; George H. Roberts, postmaster, Brooklyn, N. Y.; E. C. Mansfield, postmaster, Boston, Mass.; Frank Wyman, postmaster, St. Louis, Mo.; Joseph Stewart, Second Assistant Postmaster General; V. J. Bradley, Superintendent Railway Mail Service; E. M. Norris, assistant superintendent; J. M. Masten, Assistant Superintendent Railway Mail Service.)

It will be observed that the foregoing report declares that "the extreme expectations in regard to the pneumatic-tube service for transmitting first-class mail have not been realized," and states that while it was assumed in 1897 that the interval between carriers would be 6 seconds, it then varied from 13 to 15 seconds. We take it for granted that it was from this report that the commission, whose recommendations we now have under consideration, took its statement that the tube containers can only be dispatched at the rate of one every 15 seconds. That report also states, however, that the tube company then claimed that by certain changes in the type of the terminal apparatus and an enlargement of the power plant the containers could be dispatched very much more rapidly.

The improvements which the tube company then claimed could be made have been made, and the containers can now be dispatched at the rate of more than 7 per minute, as was demonstrated by an actual test made very recently in Boston. In Philadelphia, Pa., on December 27, a committee of business men from different organizations visited the post-office stations on an inspection of the tube service, accompanied by Congressmen J. HAMPTON MOORE, GEORGE W. EDMONDS, and GEORGE P. DARROW and two post-office superintendents. At North Philadelphia station these visitors witnessed the arrival of 10 carriers with mail in 83 seconds, an average of one every 8.3 seconds, or more than 7 per minute, and the carriers contained an average of more than 8 pounds, or over 400 letters each, which means that 61 pounds of mail per minute, or 183,000 letters per hour, were carried by the tubes.

These several reports so completely established the value of these tubes as a method of expediting the mail that Congress then took up the question of their purchase and operation by the Government. The act of August 24, 1912, provided for the appointment of a "commission consisting of two members of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, United States Senate, and two members of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, House of Representatives, to be appointed by the chairmen of the respective committees, and the Second Assistant Postmaster General." That commission was "authorized to investigate the feasibility and desirability of the Government purchasing and operating the equipment for pneumatic-tube service in the cities in which such service is now installed, together with rights to operate and extend equipment in such cities and elsewhere, and to ascertain the cost at which such purchase may be made."

After a patient and thorough investigation the chairman of that committee, Senator HOKE SMITH, of Georgia, and the Second Assistant Postmaster General, Hon. Joseph Stewart, made

a report to Congress, in which they stated the following conclusions:

In view of the testimony and reports submitted and set forth in the hearings before the joint commission to investigate the pneumatic-tube postal system and the foregoing recited facts we reach the following conclusions:

The pneumatic-tube service for the transmission of mails in the cities in which such service is now installed is a valuable adjunct to the mail transportation service for handling first class, registered, and special-delivery mails not furnished by other means of transportation, and is justified by the advantages of availability, expedition, security, and reliability.

The Postal Service and the patrons of the mails have become adjusted to this mail facility through use during the contract periods, and its considerable withdrawal or discontinuance would be regarded as an inadvisable curtailment of facilities. The present contracts expire June 30, 1916.

The tubes as now used have been for the most part laid under contracts with the Government solely for postal purposes, and if the mail service by them were discontinued there is little use to which they could be put for commercial purposes, and that only by extensive changes of terminals and relocation of supplemental lines and the terminal machinery.

Under Government ownership and operation of the tubes and equipment important advantages would accrue. The necessity for financing an enterprise attended with a certain amount of risk with the consequent cost for the hazard—ultimately paid by the Government in the contract price of service—would be obviated. Difficulties in obtaining franchises would not exist. Extensions of lines where justified would be possible at reduced cost and depending only upon the judgment of the officers of the Post Office Department and the action of Congress. The location of postal stations and the maintenance or construction of tube lines to supply them would be coordinated, thus resulting in fewer changes in line locations and abandonment of constructed lines and consequent loss. The Government would maintain and operate the tubes at a annual cost much less than it is paying under contracts for the service because it would be relieved of interest at commercial rates on bonded debts, insurance charges, taxes, dividends on stock or return on investment, and certain other expenses, such as salaries, rent, light, heat, and legal services, now obligations upon the contracting companies. The contract cost of the service for the fiscal year 1912 was \$929,460.30. It is estimated that under Government ownership and operation the cost would be approximately \$462,596.02 per annum, a saving of \$466,864.28 per annum, which would repay the first cost in 10.87 years if purchase be made at the estimated minimum value of \$5,078,560.21. If 2½ per cent be allowed upon such purchase value the first cost would be repaid in about 12.95 years.

HOKE SMITH (Chairman).
JOSEPH STEWART.

The Hon. FREDERICK L. BLACKMON, of the House, filed what has been denominated a minority report, though he does not assert anywhere in it that the tubes do not expedite the mail. He opposes the Government's purchase and operation of the tubes, and indicates his opinion that \$17,000 is an excessive annual rental for their use. Inasmuch, however, as Mr. BLACKMON's report is brief, we reproduce it in order that each Member of the House may interpret it for himself. It is as follows:

Mr. BLACKMON, of Alabama, one of the members of the Pneumatic Tube Commission appointed under the authority conferred on the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Post Roads of the House of Representatives, approved August 24, 1912, submits the following as his conclusions as derived from the testimony, hearing, and investigations of the pneumatic-tube system which is now being leased by the Federal Government and operated in the cities of New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, and St. Louis:

I agree that the testimony taken and the figures submitted by the engineers and auditors employed by the commission are correctly reported in the report, but I can not agree to recommend to Congress a purchase of these tubes. My reasons are these:

First. I do not believe that the Government can operate a pneumatic-tube system as cheaply as can private individuals.

Secondly. I am not convinced that there exists a necessity for the operation of fifty-odd miles of 8-inch pneumatic tubes.

Third. If the necessity exists for the use of pneumatic tubes, the present tubes have not the capacity to keep pace with the increase in mail matter that is bound to come from a perfection of our parcel-post system.

Fourth. A careful examination of all the testimony and facts submitted leads me to believe that the Government can take care of this class of mail by contract, using screen wagons and automobiles, more cheaply than it can be handled by any system of pneumatic tubes.

I am not prepared to say that the \$17,000 per mile paid for the service now being handled by the use of the pneumatic-tube system is excessive, but I am convinced that there is not sufficient mail handled through these tubes to warrant the Government in paying \$17,000 per mile for the service.

In view of the foregoing conclusions reached by me, I can not join in recommending to Congress a purchase of these tubes.

Respectfully submitted.

FRED L. BLACKMON.

Mr. Murdock, of Kansas, the other member of the commission representing the House, filed his views, which, while opposing the governmental purchase of the tubes, admit the value of their service and favors their discontinuance only where their use, as he understands it, is not equal to a fair percentage of their capacity. Mr. Murdock concludes his views as follows:

The actual advantage of the tubes is the acceleration of dispatch of a certain portion of the mails. There can be added to this advantage, warrantably, the fact that the tubes are available at all times and are not subject to the delays from weather conditions which occasionally block surface transportation.

The pneumatic-tube service therefore, in my view, is a defensible auxiliary for the rapid transportation of mails in those areas of mail receipt and dispatch where the volume of mail utilizes a considerable

capacity of the tubes, and it is not defensible as an auxiliary for that purpose in areas of mail where the volume of mail utilizes an inconsiderable capacity of the tubes.

In those areas of heavy mails where it is defensible the tube service is still in an experimental condition and is, in my opinion, only in the earlier stages of capacity development.

CONCLUSIONS.

In view of these facts I have reached the following conclusions:
It is not desirable that the Government purchase and operate the equipment for pneumatic-tube postal service which is now installed in various cities.

It is desirable, as it would be just and economical administration, to refuse to renew all contracts for service where less than 10 per cent of the capacity of the tube is utilized.

VICTOR MURDOCK.

Thus this question stood when, on the 17th day of July, 1915, the Postmaster General, without being specially authorized by any law to do so, except so far as new service was to be passed upon, appointed certain officers and employees of the Post Office Department to investigate and report as to the needs and practicability of the pneumatic-tube service, and so forth.

Ordinarily we would be disposed to receive the report of any commission appointed by a Cabinet officer of this Government as entitled to the greatest weight, but the bias of this particular commission is made so manifest in its report, and was likewise made so manifest by the statements of the First Assistant Postmaster General before the committee, that we can not consider it as other than an intensely partisan presentation of the question. That commission entered upon its work either under instruction or else with a determination in its own mind to report in favor of abolishing the tube service; and we base this opinion upon the fact that immediately following the announcement of its personnel the Philadelphia Inquirer printed a story from its Washington correspondent accurately forecasting the report of the commission. Besides the circumstance to which we have just alluded, the First Assistant Postmaster General, when asked before the committee whether he would have made the same report if he had known that some of his statements of fact were erroneous, refused to make a direct answer to the question, thus impressing upon our minds a belief that, though the facts were not as the commission reported them, its recommendations would nevertheless have been the same.

THE COMMISSION'S REPORT.

That report states 12 "principal limitations and disadvantages of pneumatic tubes for the transportation of mail," of which only the first 2 are controlling; and we respectfully submit that they are both based upon a gross misapprehension of the facts, as will appear from the following statement.

The report of the commission states that the capacity of the containers is limited to 5 pounds of mail and that the containers can only be dispatched through the tubes at the rate of four per minute. Upon this statement as to the capacity and dispatch of the containers the entire report of the commission must stand or fall. In refutation of the statement that the capacity of the containers is limited to 5 pounds of mail the officers of the tube companies produced before the committee one of the containers, which they filled with letters of the usual size and, after filling it, took out the contents and weighed it in the presence of the full committee. That operation demonstrated that the capacity of the containers, so far from being limited to 5 pounds, is 15 pounds. The 15 pounds, however, required a container to be closely packed, and we think it fair to consider the contents at 10 pounds, for it was obvious to every man who witnessed the demonstration that the container would carry 10 pounds without the slightest effort to pack it. That estimate, too, corresponds with the report made by the commission of 1908.

There was, of course, no opportunity to demonstrate in the open session of the committee how frequently the containers could be dispatched through the tube, but I took it upon myself to go to the city of Boston and satisfied myself on that question by a test conducted by the post office there through its superintendent of the mails. In the presence of a large number of newspaper reporters we had the matter thoroughly tested, with the result that six containers were easily dispatched every minute, and the official demonstration made for a committee of Philadelphia business men, to which we have already referred, confirms the claim that more than six containers can be dispatched every minute.

It is therefore absolutely certain that in estimating the capacity of the containers at 5 pounds and the dispatch of the containers at four per minute the postal commission subtracted 66⅔ per cent from the actual capacity of the tubes. The postal commission estimates that four containers, each containing 5 pounds of mail, can be dispatched every minute, which limits the capacity of the tubes to 20 pounds of mail per minute, while the physical demonstration shows that six containers, each

carrying 10 pounds of mail, can be sent every minute, thus exhibiting a capacity of 60 pounds of mail to the minute, or three times as much as was estimated by the commission.

Having minimized the capacity of the tubes to the extent of 66⅔ per cent, it is not remarkable that the commission would then report that automobiles could deliver the mail as expeditiously as the tubes. It is, however, remarkable that the report in which a discontinuance of the tubes is advised upon the ground that they do not materially expedite the delivery of the mail should be accompanied by tables which show that on a test instituted by the commission itself the tubes expedited on that one day 4,645,771 pieces of mail. It is little short of an insult to the intelligence of Congress for that commission to tell us that the tubes do not expedite the mail, and then attach to their report containing that statement data which show that the tubes delivered over four and a half million letters more promptly than they could have been delivered by any other service.

The statements of the commission with respect to the congestion, and the consequent impediment to automobile service, were contradicted in every instance by Representatives in Congress from the cities having the tube service. We select the city of St. Louis as the smallest of those where the tubes have been installed; and it is fair to suppose that the commission found the least difficulty in ascertaining the facts in regard to that city. The commission states that there is little or no surface congestion in St. Louis, its exact language being:

There is little or no surface congestion in St. Louis, and an automobile or other conveyance is able to travel rapidly.

Against that statement of the commission, the Representatives in the House from the city of St. Louis oppose their most positive statements to the contrary; and Representative DYER declared to the committee that the travel by vehicle is so tedious on account of the congestion that he often walks from his office to the courthouse, even when his automobile is at hand.

Referring again to that part of the commission's report which covers St. Louis, we call attention to this statement:

The committee, however, believe that no material advantage results from the use of the pneumatic-tube service in St. Louis.

And that statement is made in the face of a letter addressed to the commission by the postmaster at St. Louis, in which he says:

Approximately 75 per cent of the mails now forwarded via pneumatic tubes could probably be handled by screen motor wagons without additional cost to the department and with no delay in dispatch or delivery, but the other 25 per cent, which includes important eastern mails for delivery particularly in the down-town sections, as well as dispatches of similar mail made on close connections after deposit in territory adjacent to the tube service, would be very seriously delayed.

Similar statements and contradictions could be cited until this report would be extended to a tedious length, and we therefore forbear to say more in that respect.

Leaving aside what the officers of the tube companies have said as springing from their personal or financial interest, and leaving aside what the postal commission have said as due to their partisan bias, we think that great importance should be attached to what was said by the intelligent and reputable business men who appeared before the committee, representing practically every business organization in the several cities from which they came. Those gentlemen testified that the business men in their respective cities are absolutely unanimous in their demand for a continuance, and even for an extension, of the tube service. We do not think that business men are entitled to any privileges under this Government not extended to all other citizens, but we do think that when these business men assert that a certain service is of great advantage to them, and they are willing to pay all and even much more than it costs the Government to perform that service, they are fairly entitled to have it. Since the Government renders postal service for pay, it ought to give the very best service for which those who patronize its post offices are willing to pay.

The testimony before the committee and the reports of the Post Office Department all show that while the first-class mail—the kind transported through these tubes—constitutes approximately 25 per cent of the entire mail according to weight, it yields approximately 75 per cent of the entire postal revenues. When we consider that this first-class mail not only pays the entire cost of handling it but contributes a very large sum toward paying the cost of all other classes, it would seem too plain for argument that every facility for its dispatch and delivery ought to be provided by the Government; and the cost of expediting it can not fairly be considered an objection so long as it constitutes approximately one-fourth of our mail matter and produces approximately three-fourths of our postal receipts. It is a great mistake to suppose that the only people who are benefited by the expedition of these mails are those who live in the

cities where the tubes are in use, because the correspondence of those city merchants, bankers, and manufacturers is in large part with the people of the smaller towns and cities, who thus have their own mail expedited.

But even if these business men who have been using these tubes for years, and who must, therefore, fully understand whether they are an advantage or a disadvantage, are all mistaken in what they have said, and even if we conclude, against the judgment of all who have spoken on the question except the last commission, that the tubes do not expedite the mail, we would still insist that the tube service should not be discontinued in the cities where it has been installed so long as the mail it carries pays the entire expense of handling it, including the rental of the tubes. We say this because we know it is utterly indefensible for the Government of the United States to aggravate the present traffic congestion in these cities by adding the new automobiles which would be required to substitute these tubes. It will not answer us to say that the additional automobiles will be but a very small percentage of those now using the streets, because when the streets are once crowded the addition of a single vehicle may be the means of a serious accident, involving the loss of life or limb. You might add 50 vehicles where only 5 were already employed, and though the increase would be 1,000 per cent it might not result in the slightest congestion. On the other hand, to add 50 vehicles where there were already 5,000, would add only 1 per cent, and yet that 1 per cent might grievously aggravate the congestion.

It is not necessary to argue to those who live in cities or to those who visit our great cities that the wisdom of traffic control lies in a constant diminution of surface traffic. This truth is so palpable that the cities of this country are to-day spending millions and hundreds of millions constructing subways, so that they may take persons from the surface and transport them underground. What shall be thought of its wisdom and its justice if in these same cities which are taking people off of the surface and putting them under the ground, the Federal Government takes articles from underground to transport them on the surface?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Is it not a fact that the postmaster at Boston said the pneumatic tubes were no good, generally speaking?

Mr. TAGUE. No; the postmaster at Boston said he was opposed to the tubes as they are at present constituted and arranged. He did say, however, that he would be in favor of the tube system to the city of Cambridge, which is close to the city of Boston.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. So far as the local conditions between the Boston post office and Cambridge were concerned 25 years ago, when it was my good fortune to be at Cambridge, there was no congestion of traffic between Boston proper and Cambridge. Have conditions so changed that there is a congestion of traffic? I should think there would be no difficulty in having expeditious traffic by automobile service from Boston out Commonwealth Avenue, across the Harvard Bridge, and out Massachusetts Avenue to Cambridge Station proper.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, in the last 25 years the city of Cambridge has enlarged and developed greatly, as have the adjacent towns and cities. They are all part of the general postal system of the city of Boston. In other words, they are all substations of the city of Boston, and the amount of mail going in that direction is far greater than the gentleman would imagine, unless he has seen the conditions in later years.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am addressing my inquiry specifically as to the congested condition of traffic on the thoroughfares leading from the Boston post office to the Cambridge station post office.

Mr. TAGUE. The congestion in the city of Boston from the general post office to the bridge leading to Cambridge is just as great as in any other part of the city. It is impossible to drive an automobile through that part of the city at any greater speed than in any other part of the heart of the city of Boston.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course as to the other proposition which the gentleman advances, that the increase of mail makes it necessary to continue the pneumatic-tube service, I take issue with him, because it is a fundamental proposition that all the mail matter which goes from the Boston post office to the Cambridge Station post office can not be carried by pneumatic tube. Some of it must be carried by automobile cars. With the increase of mail traffic naturally more mail will have to be sent by automobile cars, and to have the supplementary means of pneumatic-tube service does not relieve the situation, does not expedite the delivery of the mail, except just a fraction of it.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the gentleman I will say that I am not advocating any pneumatic-tube service to the city of Cambridge.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought the gentleman said the postmaster of Boston was in favor of a pneumatic-tube system to Cambridge.

Mr. TAGUE. In a letter sent to the postmaster of Boston by the mayor of the city of Cambridge and by the business men of the city of Cambridge, which letter is in the record, he was asked to put in operation the pneumatic-tube system to the city of Cambridge, and in a letter to the city government of Cambridge he told them he was in favor of a pneumatic tube to the city of Cambridge. I stated that in answer to the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] as to whether the postmaster was opposed to pneumatic tubes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand that the present postmaster of Boston is only in favor of pneumatic tubes for long-distance service. It is conceded by anyone who knows anything about it that they are not serviceable for short circuits—a quarter of a mile or a half mile. If they have any advantage at all, it is for dispatching mail for long distances—4, 5, or 10 miles. The advantage of sending these bullets through the pneumatic tube for short distances is no gain at all.

Mr. TAGUE. I do not agree with the gentleman as to that, and I think that before we are through we will prove that that is not the fact.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is not the very merit of the pneumatic-tube service that it passes through short distances where the travel is very congested?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Nobody contends that it ought to be established between New York and Chicago, but through such districts where the vehicular traffic is so great as to increase the danger of injury and loss of life.

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Is it not a fact that the postmaster of Boston said in a general way that these tubes were no good, but that they might be of advantage between the post office and Cambridge?

Mr. TAGUE. I do not remember any declaration of the postmaster of Boston to that effect.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Something has been said about the charges of the pneumatic-tube company being extortionate and out of all proportion to the value of the service. Does the gentleman know what it cost to install and operate these tubes?

Mr. TAGUE. I will say to the gentleman that I am not here to argue what it is going to cost or what it cost the companies to install them.

Mr. GORDON. Does not the gentleman want to know something about it before he forces it on the Government?

Mr. TAGUE. If the gentleman will be calm, we will not force anything on him. I do not imagine anyone here is going to force anything on the Government. We are arguing the question and placing it fairly and squarely before the House.

Mr. GORDON. Is it not a fair part of the argument to tell us what the service is worth before we buy it?

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, every Congress that has investigated this matter, every commission that has investigated the matter, has reported in favor of the tubes; and the price as set by the commission that has investigated it was \$17,000 a mile. That has been continued, and I am not in favor of making any appropriation set by any corporation. Mr. Chairman, I may say further that I do not believe those who own these tubes or operate these tubes are ready or willing to foist anything on the Government at exorbitant rates. On the contrary, they have been willing and have already placed their books at the disposal of the commissions that have been representing the Government. They have placed everything at the disposal of the commission and told them everything that is to be told. They go further than that and say that they are ready now to submit the cost of the tubes and the cost of the operation of the tubes to any commission that is appointed that will treat with them fairly, and they are ready to stand or fall upon the decision of that commission.

Mr. MOON. What right has the gentleman to demand that the Government shall pay for these tubes?

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I am not demanding that the Government pay for the tubes. If it is for the efficiency of the department, if the people who are the Government are to be governed by that expenditure, they have the right, through their representatives, to come to this Congress and ask for any appropriation, no matter how great it is.

Mr. MOON. Yes; you have the right to come and ask for what you want, but when the facts show that the service is not good for the Government, that it can be carried by automobile one-third cheaper, and that the postmaster of Boston says that it is no good, you ought not to ask the Government to buy it.

Mr. IGOE. Is any of this money going for aeroplanes?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes; the automobiles and the aeroplanes have taken the money. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the chairman of the committee or the postmaster of Boston as to their opinion of the tubes. I have lived in Boston and am doing business in Boston at the present time. Every business concern, every business organization, and every business man in Boston are protesting against the abolition of these tubes. We made tests just the same as the commission appointed by the Postmaster General, who went about their work determined to do away with the tubes. We made our test fairly in the presence of newspaper men, in the presence of men interested, and the test was made by representatives of the Post Office Department.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. The question I would like to have answered is, Which is the most efficient method of delivering the mail, in the city of Boston say, by pneumatic tube or by automobile?

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, there is no question in my mind, from what I have seen in the dispatch of first-class mail, and that is the reason for these tubes—there is no question in my mind but what the pneumatic tubes are far superior to the automobile.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon], the chairman of the committee, made the statement, if I caught it correctly, that these tubes were worthless.

Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts. He said that the postmaster said so.

Mr. MOON. That is the practical effect of what he said. The fact is that there are four or five stoppages in these tubes, on account of the crooked route, and it is claimed that in Boston the automobile can carry the mail more quickly to the depot than can be done through the tubes. A commission of five post-office officials were appointed by the Postmaster General to investigate this question, and they have undertaken to make experiments, and those five gentlemen recommended that the tubes in Boston be discontinued, because it is not to the advantage of the Government to keep them.

Mr. GARNER. I do not live in a city, and have had no experience or observation with respect to the tubes, but I desire to vote for the most efficient system the Post Office Department can conceive to deliver the mails either in the city or in the country.

Mr. TAGUE. If the gentleman will permit me, I want to quote to him what I consider a fair test and a fair answer to his question.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. IGOE. Is the principal controversy over the efficiency of it or the cost of it?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Both.

Mr. TAGUE. It seems to be more the cost than anything else.

Mr. GORDON. Is not that a proper thing to consider?

Mr. TAGUE. No; it is not a proper thing to consider when efficiency is at stake, when the question of delivery is at stake.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Would not the postmaster at Boston ordinarily be considered good authority upon the subject of this matter?

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, on Saturday, December 30, upon the permission of the postmaster of Boston, I went to the South Station tube room in my district, and that is the station that is in controversy all through the report of this commission. The postmaster of Boston sent as his representatives to make the test the superintendent of mails, the assistant superintendent of mails, one of his roundsmen, and the superintendent of the South Station. I went to the South Station tube room to find out if the report of this commission was correct. No one in any other station knew that we were there. First of all, I wanted to find out for myself, as a member of this committee, whether the statement that these tubes could only be run at intervals of 15 seconds was true. Under a stop watch, held by the superintendent of mails, the representative of the Post Office Department, these tubes came into the South Station loaded with mail at intervals of less than 10 seconds. At least more than six came in every minute. Then we wanted to find out whether the statement of this commission that the capacity of these tubes was under 5 pounds was correct. We weighed the mail taken from the tubes as it came into the South Station, and with the exception of one tube, which contained a

special-delivery letter, in every tube we weighed we found more than 8 pounds of mail, and then we tested the tube as to its capacity and found that the tube would carry 15 pounds. We went further. In the report of this commission they say that it took four minutes and a half for a carrier to go from the South Station to the general office. We took a cylinder and put in that cylinder a letter signed by the superintendent of mails, and that tube was dispatched to the general office with the word to return this tube at once, and the time taken for the round trip of that tube from the South Station to the general post office was 3 minutes and 17 seconds. In the committee I asked the postmaster of my city if he was ready to stand upon the statement that it took four minutes and a half for that tube to go from the South Station to the general office, and he agreed with me that he could walk from the South Station to his own office in that time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Did that involve the opening of the tube at the general office and the closing of it again?

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, the tube was sent from the South Station. It was opened, and the letter was read to see what was to be done with the tube. The letter was then put back into the tube in the carrier and the carrier was sealed and the carrier sent back again to the South Station.

Mr. MANN. And all that operation was completed in 3 minutes and 17 seconds?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. MOON. What proportion of all of the mail is letters?

Mr. TAGUE. I should judge from the evidence submitted to the committee it was from 12 to 15 per cent.

Mr. MOON. Say 12 per cent. What proportion of that 12 per cent is carried by the tubes?

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I will state that I can not tell just what the proportion is, but I will insert in the Record those figures.

Mr. MOON. Is it not about from 55 to 60 per cent?

Mr. TAGUE. I do not know exactly, but I can find out; but I do know this, that according to the report of this commission in the city of New York the number of pieces of mail carried per day are 1,034,678; in the city of Brooklyn, 9,488; in the city of Boston, 327,364; in Chicago, 319,884; in the city of St. Louis, 339,829; and all of this mail originated and delivered in these cities. None of this mail comes from outside. None of this mail comes on the railroad, but it is mail that is collected in the city and sent to the several stations by tube. This is a very small proportion of the general first-class mail carried daily in the pneumatic tubes. Now, it costs the Government \$2,673.77 per day, and they get in return for that from these cities \$40,624.94, showing a net profit on the mail collected and delivered in these cities alone, that is handled by pneumatic mail tubes, of \$37,950.87. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this from the statistics filed by this commission—

Mr. MOON. Now, let us get down to facts a little bit. I know the gentleman wants to continue that tube very badly, but let us see whether that ought to be done. Now, 12 per cent of the mail that goes to the gentleman's city is letter mail. Sixty per cent of that is carried by the tubes. Now, does not that proof show very clearly in this case, owing to the stoppages of the tubes and the fact that they destroy the mail entirely frequently, that it can be expedited better by automobiles than it can by the other methods? Is not that the report of five disinterested Government officials who under the law have investigated and reported upon that question?

Mr. TAGUE. Why, Mr. Chairman, no.

Mr. MOON. That is the proof in this record.

Mr. TAGUE. I want to say frankly I do not believe the gentlemen who investigated were disinterested. The evidence submitted to the committee by the First Assistant Postmaster General, when we asked him whether or not he would have sent in a different report if he had found these figures were incorrect, was that he would have made the same report, showing to me at least that they went into this thing determined to do away with the pneumatic-tube service.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. MEEKER. Just a moment to say that when the committee reached St. Louis the business men of St. Louis were given the munificent time of 30 minutes to get ready for it.

Mr. TAGUE. That is better than was accorded in Boston, because they were not given any consideration. Mr. Chairman, again to carry out the question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], the committee reported that it took 17 minutes

and 50 seconds to send mail out to the Uphams Corner post office; the superintendent of mails again made a test, and the mail was sent to Uphams Corner post office, was opened by the clerks there, and returned to the South Station post office in 16 minutes by his own watch. Then, Mr. Chairman, we made a further test. We made a test from the South Station to Essex Street, round trip, and it only took 2 minutes and 28 seconds. Then, upon the request of the superintendent of mails we made a test as against the automobile from the South Station post office to the general post office, and the Post Office Department supplied the machine and they supplied the driver and they supplied his assistant, and he took a sack of mail from the post office at South Station and with all the speed that he could make, running up the stairs of the post office with the bag on his back, it took him six minutes to deliver that bag of mail intact.

Mr. MOON. Why did you not have some of that proof before the committee?

Mr. TAGUE. Just a minute. Then the superintendent of mails took a sack of mail with approximately the same amount of mail, and he took three clerks, and the moment the automobile left the station he started to fill the carriers. He filled 12 carriers with the mail, and from the time the carriers were first opened, without any mail in them, up to the time that they were filled and the carriers delivered and emptied at the general post office, it was 3 minutes and 20 seconds, or 2½ minutes faster than the automobile went. I made that test, Mr. Chairman, to see whether or not it took 44 minutes to send 77 carriers to the general office, and 12 carriers by their own hands were sent in 3 minutes, proving to me that they were not fair in the report to the people of the city. Now, if the rest of that report is written on the same figures and can not be substantiated better than they have substantiated it in Boston—and I have seen the records as they have been sent from the city of Philadelphia—

Mr. MOON. You are talking about some stuff you have gotten up since this report was made.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, it is all right to talk about getting up stuff since reports are made; I am herewith making a reply to such reports after a real test.

Mr. MOON. Is it not a fact that what you are talking about has been written up since this report?

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, that is the only way I have of proving my case. I was obliged to make my test, and no one in Boston knew the test was being made.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not a fact that the pneumatic-tube report was in your hands at the time?

Mr. TAGUE. That was so. I was a member of the committee and I was handed this report on Wednesday, and I was told that it was not to be submitted to the public until Saturday.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. What is the date of that report?

Mr. TAGUE. I do not know what the date is. It was made to me on Wednesday, December 6, with the instruction it was not to be given to the public until Saturday, December 9.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is on October 13, showing that from October 13 up to the time of the hearing there was no opportunity to make these tests.

Mr. TAGUE. I am sure I knew nothing about the test nor knew nothing about the report, but I was asked in the committee to vote the judgment of the Postmaster General and his assistants whom he had appointed to send this line of business to destruction. I am not ready as a member of this committee to vote to confiscate, as this does, the property of people in my district who have put their money into it, a venture that has had the indorsement of every commission since it was inaugurated until this one; and I am not ready to rest my case in the hands of a biased commission that was sent there for no other purpose. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized. I am not desiring to make a speech at this moment. I would suggest the absence of a quorum unless somebody desires to use some of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand. Is the gentleman making a motion?

Mr. MANN. No. I am occupying the floor, Mr. Chairman, consuming a part of the hour to which I am entitled.

Mr. MOON. Does the gentleman want to consume the time?

Mr. MANN. I think, unless some one wants to consume part of the time—

Mr. MOON. Does the gentleman want to continue when we meet again?

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; I do not desire to do that. I hope you will be able to agree upon a division of time when we meet again. I think we had better rise, though.

Mr. MOON. I suppose the gentleman wants to adjourn. If so, I have no objection to move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRISP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 19410) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. MANN. Not yet.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. MORIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the National Guard on the border.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of the National Guard on the border. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 10, 1917, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report on reexamination of Pass Manchac, La. (H. Doc. No. 1900); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report as to the rents received from properties located on sites of proposed public buildings purchased by the United States Government in this city (H. Doc. No. 1901); to the Committee on Expenditures on Public Buildings and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MCCLINTIC, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 16407) for the relief of J. L. Bonner, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1270), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 19879) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Grand Army post of Columbia, Pa., two bronze or brass cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 19880) regulating proceedings before special committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 19881) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate condemned cannons and balls; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 19882) for the control and regulation of the waters of Niagara River above the Falls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 19883) to coordinate, unify, and consolidate the financial system of the United States by creating and establishing a Federal exchange, amending the postal savings act, and amending the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 19884) to provide for the construction of the King Hill project, Idaho; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 19885) to amend the act of October 3, 1913, entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19886) to amend the act of October 3, 1913, entitled "An act to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 335) for the appointment of four members of the Board of Managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 19887) granting a pension to James F. Lingafelter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19888) granting an increase of pension to Dorothy Swihart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 19889) granting an increase of pension to Rufus F. Gibbs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19890) granting an increase of pension to John C. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 19891) granting an increase of pension to William H. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERS: A bill (H. R. 19892) granting a pension to George L. Bomberger, Doctor of Medicine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19893) granting a pension to Stocton Sponseller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19894) granting a pension to A. J. Cline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURKE: A bill (H. R. 19895) granting a pension to Mary Stultz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19896) for the relief of the J. Ph. Binzel Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 19897) granting an increase of pension to John D. Storey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 19898) granting an increase of pension to Howard A. Littlejohn; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 19899) for the relief of Mrs. Mie Uratake; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 19900) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Gossert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GORDON: A bill (H. R. 19901) to grant authority of the Reiss Steamship Co., of Duluth, Minn., to change the name of its steamer *Frederick B. Wells* to *Otto M. Reiss*; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19902) to grant authority to the Reiss Steamship Co., of Duluth, Minn., to change the name of its steamer *Frank H. Peavey* to *William A. Reiss*; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19903) to grant authority to the Reiss Steamship Co., of Duluth, Minn., to change the name of its steamer *George W. Peavey* to *Richard J. Reiss*; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19904) to grant authority to the Reiss Steamship Co., of Duluth, Minn., to change the name of its steamer *Frank T. Heffelfinger* to *Clemens A. Reiss*; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 19905) granting an increase of pension to Robert O. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19906) granting an increase of pension to William F. Collins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19907) granting an increase of pension to James L. Willis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19908) granting an increase of pension to William H. Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 19909) granting a pension to Elizabeth P. Bickhart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 19910) granting a pension to Maria C. Vance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19911) granting an increase of pension to Alphonso G. Andrews; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 19912) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 19913) granting an increase of pension to Marshall Barnes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: A bill (H. R. 19914) granting a pension to John T. Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 19915) granting an increase of pension to Frank Nouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19916) granting an increase of pension to Isaac B. Hawke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 19917) granting an increase of pension to Ellen K. Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19918) granting a pension to William M. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LESHNER: A bill (H. R. 19919) granting an increase of pension to Joseph D. Fulmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19920) granting an increase of pension to B. W. Brittain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19921) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Kulp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 19922) granting an increase of pension to Belle Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19923) granting an increase of pension to John Pope; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19924) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19925) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Twyford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19926) granting a pension to John B. Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MORIN: A bill (H. R. 19927) granting an increase of pension to John J. McKenna; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 19928) granting a pension to Bird Nieman, widow of Edward Nieman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19929) granting a pension to Henry Turcott; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 19930) granting an increase of pension to Ezra Stevens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 19931) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette Murry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 19932) granting an increase of pension to William Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19933) granting an increase of pension to William R. Waddell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Florida: A bill (H. R. 19934) granting a pension to Emory Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19935) granting a pension to L. L. Stewart; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19936) correcting the military record of J. C. Glass; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY: Petition of German-American Alliance of Pennsylvania, asking embargo on foodstuffs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of J. Bunton, William Hallmont, Evan Townsend, Mike White, James M. Patterson, Josie Jones, Edward Ford, Frank Battisch, George Bourdess, Thomas Bourdess, W. M. Wills, James Chambers, Albert Shope, Thomas Hobson, Thomas Carroll, J. N. George, William Phillips, William Fox, David J. Weaver, John Tulowitzki, Amos Davis, George S. Wilson, James J. Finan, Joseph Plows, E. F. Stahl, John Walker, M. E. Yoder, Michael Shannon, R. Dryden Peel, Joseph Childon, W. J. Claar, John A. Flynn, J. C. Custer, W. J. Postlewait, R. V. Clemence, Harry Johnson, John Buchanan, Henry Kelley, Frank Podboy, A. J. Oaks, A. Garland, Ward McElwee, John Demko, Russell Yost, John J. Kinney, John Hayes, Ralph Jackson, Arthur Hand, and J. W. Cawthern, all of South Fork, and Richard Stafford, of Ehrenfeld, all in the State of Pennsylvania, for an embargo on the exportation of farm products, clothing, and other necessities of life; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRITTEN: Petition of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., against prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Memorial of National Association of Life Underwriters in reference to bill for incorporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Enoch Halley and 85 other citizens of New York for peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, relative to pneumatic mail-tube service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of American Federation of Teachers, for increase in pay of employees of public schools of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of the American Architect, Everyday Mechanic's Magazine, and publishing house of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, against increase in rates of second-class mail matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y., against all prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Federal Civil Service Society of the State of New York, for increase in pay of Government employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of National Temperance Council, for passage of prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURNETT: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Alabama, relative to eight-hour law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of railway mail clerks and others, for increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARY: Petitions of New York State Federation of Labor and the Woman's Benefit Association of Maccabees, opposing increases in second-class rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Berton Brady, in re increased postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Wisconsin Dairymen's Association, in re certain legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of International Typographical Union and Bonfort's Wine and Spirit Circular (Inc.), in re postal rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Empire State Society, Sons of the American Revolution, favoring House bill 269, for purchase of Monticello; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey, favoring suffrage for women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of the State of New Jersey, against prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Wisconsin, against prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of 1,100 citizens of the United States, favoring embargo on wheat; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOCHT: Evidence in support of House bill 6585, for the relief of John E. Pierce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 10435, for the relief of Charles H. Birley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 7707, for the relief of Nathaniel S. Agnew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 19638, for the relief of Calvin M. Skinner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence in support of House bill 7083, for the relief of William E. Beistline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Memorial of Legislative Assembly of Porto Rico, protesting against prohibitory legislation for Porto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of Loyal Legion of Illinois, favoring bill for a volunteer officers' retired list; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Carson, Pirie, Scott & Co., of Chicago, Ill., concerning proposed amendment to the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of 50 citizens of Morris, Ill., against prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, of Rockford, Ill., against passage of House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of committee of editors, relative to increase in second-class mail rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of business men of Philadelphia, Pa., relative to retaining pneumatic tubes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of members of Washington Camp, No. 537, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Lancaster, Pa., against manipulation of food prices, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of Presbytery of Blairsville, Pa., favoring Jones Sunday-rest bill; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of Hagar & Bro., of Lancaster, Pa., against Stevens price-maintenance bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of 59 citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., favoring a Christian amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of local union of A. F. G. W. U., Bellaire, Ohio, against mailing privilege; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial of American Institute of Architects, urging appointment of expert commission to frame a public-building policy for the United States; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petitions of Stove Mounters' Union, Local 96; Typographical Union No. 8; St. Louis Star; and James A. Rogers, all of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of Senate bill No. 4429 and House bill No. 18986; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Local 279, of United Brewery Workmen, and Bakery and Confectionery Workers, both of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against prohibition for the District of Columbia, and also against national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOON: Papers to accompany House bill 16903, for the relief of William H. Travis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NORTH: Petition of Rev. William J. Small and 28 other citizens of Reynoldsville, praying for the passage of the bill now pending in Congress to exclude liquor advertising and solicitation from the mails and express; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of C. R. McAdoo, of Indiana, Pa., and 52 other citizens of the twenty-seventh congressional district, praying for the passage of the national-prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. Susan B. Hilty, of Apollo, Pa., and 64 other citizens of the twenty-seventh congressional district, praying for the passage of the Federal motion-picture censorship bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. OAKLEY: Petition of citizens of Hartford, Conn., protesting against the passage of mail-exclusion and national-prohibition acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PARKER of New York: Memorial of voters of Saratoga Springs, favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REILLY: Petitions opposing House bill 18966, Randall mail-exclusion bill; Senate bill 4429, Bankhead mail-exclusion bill; Senate bill 1082, Sheppard District of Columbia prohibition bill; House joint resolution 84, Webb nation-wide prohibition bill; and House bill 17850, by Mr. HOWARD, to prohibit commerce in intoxicating liquors between the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, against prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROWE: Petition of Albert E. Burr Co., of New York, relative to pneumatic-tube service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the Christian Herald and New York Photo-Engravers' Union, No. 1, against increase in postage on second-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, favoring passage of the Nolan minimum wage bill; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. ROWLAND: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, against prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of sundry citizens of thirty-third New York district, favoring Anthony amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petitions of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, in favor of and opposing prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WASON: Petition of C. N. Eames, F. E. Adams, H. C. Davison, M. E. S. Jones, J. E. Donovan, M. W. Brown, Ira O. Willard, Winfield S. Aldrich, Earl H. Barrett, E. M. Osborne,

Harry Murphy, John F. Reilly, W. S. Lyon, G. R. Estee, George F. Ball, J. W. Villemaire, W. C. Read, Richard Collins, H. N. Burbank, F. H. Follansbee, C. H. Wright, and A. W. Flanders, railway postal clerks in New Hampshire, favoring an increase of salary of postal clerks and in support of House bill 18895; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 10, 1917.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, lend Thine aid to these Thy servants in this honorable Senate, that all their work, begun, continued, and ended in Thee, may redound to the honor and glory of Thy name and the advancement of the cause of truth and righteousness among men. We ask for Christ's sake. Amen.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day.

Mr. SMOOT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fletcher	Martine, N. J.	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Gallinger	Nelson	Smoot
Brady	Gronna	Norris	Sterling
Brandeggee	Husting	Oliver	Sutherland
Bryan	James	Overman	Swanson
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Page	Thomas
Chilton	Jones	Pittman	Tillman
Clapp	Kenyon	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Clark	Kern	Robinson	Walsh
Colt	Kirby	Saulsbury	Watson
Culberson	Lane	Shafroth	Williams
Curtis	Lea, Tenn.	Sheppard	Works
Dillingham	Lodge	Sherman	
Fernald	McLean	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. WALSH. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. LEE] is detained from the Senate on account of illness.

Mr. CHILTON. My colleague, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF], is absent on account of illness.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I rise to announce the absence of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] on account of illness, and to state that the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] is absent on official business.

Mr. CLARK. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. WARREN] from the city. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is detained from the Senate on account of sickness in his family.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The Secretary will read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. OVERMAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. ROBINSON presented petitions of sundry citizens of Arkansas, praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Socialist Lodge of Pine Bluff, Ark., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to change the postage rate on second-class matter, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Patriotic League of Porto Rican Students, of San Juan, Porto Rico, praying for the establishment of a civil government for the island of Porto Rico, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the board of education of Lincoln, Nebr., praying that surplus fees received from naturalization sources be used for the education of immigrants, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the American Association of State Highway Officials, of St. Louis, Mo., praying for the completion of the topographic map of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

He also presented a petition of the board of temperance, prohibition, and public morals of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of leg-

islation to prohibit the transmission of liquor advertisements through the mails, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HUSTING presented memorials of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transmission of liquor advertisements through the mails, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MYERS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Montana, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the sinking of artesian wells on the public domain, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. STONE presented memorials of sundry citizens of Missouri, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transmission of liquor advertisements through the mails, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Worcester, Provincetown, Concord, Boston, Amherst, and New Bedford, all in the State of Massachusetts, praying for national prohibition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OLIVER presented memorials of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit the transmission of liquor advertisements through the mails, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Somerset County, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to found the Government of the United States on Christianity, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BORAH presented petitions of sundry citizens of Idaho, praying that Government aid be given the so-called Dubois reclamation project, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented the petition of Robert J. Clendenin and sundry citizens of Colfax, Wash., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. THOMPSON presented a memorial of the students and faculty of the Dickinson County High School, of Chapman, Kans., remonstrating against any increase in rate of postage on letters and newspapers, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Seventh Kansas Congressional District Rural Letter Carriers' Association, of Pratt, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to place the compensation of rural carriers on a more equitable basis, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Paola, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to grant pensions to the widows and minor children of Spanish War Veterans, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Sunflower Council, No. 31, United Commercial Travelers, of Salina, Kans., praying for a revision of postal rates, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Sacramento (Cal.) Branch of the Railway Mail Association, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the retirement of superannuated civil-service employees, which was referred to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

Mr. NORRIS. I present resolutions adopted at the last annual meeting of the Nebraska State Irrigation Association, held at Bridgeport, Nebr., in December, 1916. I ask that they be printed in the RECORD and be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Public Lands and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolutions adopted by the Nebraska State Irrigation Association at its December, 1916, annual meeting, held in Bridgeport, Nebr.

Whereas it has become an open secret that the Government has taken over the extra carrying capacity of the Tri-State Canal for the purpose of extending said canal to cover the territory lying under the original Government survey of the North Platte project and east of the present terminus of both the Tri-State and the Government Canals; and

Whereas many homesteaders continue to occupy their holdings in patient anticipation of the coming of the water, not a few of whom have reached an age when the loss of a year is absolutely irretrievable: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of this association that the Reclamation Service should push the construction of the project to speedy completion; and be it further

Resolved, That we urgently request our Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their best endeavors to have included in the next appropriation bill the estimated amount required for the construction of the proposed extension of said canal.

Resolutions adopted by the Nebraska State Irrigation Association at its December, 1916, annual meeting, held in Bridgeport, Nebr.

Whereas the North Platte Valley is the heart of the largest irrigated territory of Nebraska, and is one of the richest agricultural regions of the United States; and